

THE Catholic MIND

No. 985

VOL. XLIII

Bishops' Statement on Peace.....	1
A New Colonial Order.....	6
Family Life is Threatened.....	11
Mr. Simple on Racial Equality.....	15
The Plain Man and the Peace.....	21
The Editorial Mind:	
The Election.....	31
Church Unity Octave	31
Another Change of Front?	32
Farms for Servicemen	33
Need for Education.....	33
Are Children Necessary?	35
Religious Unity	37
Anti-Semitism Prior to 1500.....	40
Some Things Old and New.....	61

JANUARY, 1945

BX801
C36
443

Cardinal Newman Classics

Three of the important works edited for college and seminary classes and for private study by the outstanding Newman scholar

DANIEL M. O'CONNELL, S.J.

APOLOGIA PRO VITA SUA.....\$2.00

With foreword by Hilaire Belloc. Outline biography of Newman. Select bibliography of his works. The preface to 1865 edition. Text: 270 pp., 5 chapters.

47 pp. of notes by editor. 73 pp. of supplementary matter—the Kingsley correspondence, Kingsley reply, letters by Ullathorne and others.

IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY.....\$2.00

With foreword by Brother Leo. Editor's introduction. Excerpts from Life of Newman by Wilfrid Ward. Outline biography. Preface by Newman. 21 Discourses. Bibliography of Newman's works.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF CATHOLICS.....\$2.00

Author's dedication. Author's preface. Foreword by James J. Daly, S.J. Editor's Apologia. Text: 310 pp. Editor's notes: 42 pp.

The three books in a set: \$5.00

Special prices for each title in quantity of 10 or more

THE AMERICA PRESS

70 EAST 45TH STREET

NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

THE CATHOLIC MIND, January, 1945. Volume XLIII. No. 985. Published by The America Press, Grand Central Terminal Building, 70 E. 45th Street, New York 17, N. Y. Subscription, postpaid. Yearly \$2.00; Canada and foreign, \$2.50. Single copy, 20 cents.

Entered as second-class matter October 22, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Reentered as second class matter January 20, 1943 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1870. Acceptance for mailing at special rates of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1913. Trade-mark "Catholic Mind" Reg. U. S. Patent Off.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLIII

JANUARY, 1945

NO. 985

Bishops' Statement on Peace

WE have met the challenge of war. Shall we meet the challenge of peace?

This is the question uppermost in the minds of men everywhere who in suffering and hardship have stood out against ruthless aggression. The men of our armed forces, the masses of our citizens, our leaders, all want to be true to our soldiers who have given so much, some even their lives, in this war for freedom. They want to be true, as well, to future generations on whom we have been forced to place a heavy burden as the price for their freedoms.

Honestly, earnestly we want to garner from the sacrifices, hardships and losses which have gone into this war the full fruits of victory in a good peace. The foremost problem in post-war planning is how to secure for ourselves and all the world a just and lasting peace.

Recently representatives of the

United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and China at Dumbarton Oaks formulated and presented to their Governments broad tentative proposals for an international organization for "the maintenance of peace and security and the creation of conditions which make for peace." These proposals have been given to the public for full study and discussion by peoples of all countries.

Our own Secretary of State has expressed the hope that leaders of our national thought and opinion will discuss them in the spirit of constructive effort.

Public opinion in our country can exert a tremendous effort in making the peace and determining the manner of international collaboration for its maintenance. If public opinion is indifferent or uninformed, we shall run the risk of a bad peace and perhaps return to the tragedy of "power politics," which, in the past, divided

nations and sowed the seeds of war.

If public opinion is alert and informed, we can have a lasting peace and security. It is imperative that all our citizens recognize their responsibility in the making and maintenance of the peace. They must inform themselves on the issues and form their judgments in the light of sound reason and our Christian democratic traditions.

They must free themselves from hatred, from distrust, from the spirit of mere expediency, from national greed and from indifference to right in the use of might, and they must form their judgments on the basis of stern objective realities.

This war came largely from bad education. It was not brought on by primitives or unlettered peoples. The contemporary philosophy which asserts the right of aggression is the creation of scholars. Discarding moral principles and crowding God out of human life, scholars produced the monstrous philosophies which, embodied in political and social systems, enslave human reason and destroy the consciousness of innate human rights and duties.

In these systems the notion of the common good is utterly distorted; it is no longer conceived as the consequence of the common enjoyment of rights and the common discharge of duties, but the creation of the caprice of a dictator or a party.

The gilded dreams of a new era,

which these systems heralded, have proved to be a hideous nightmare. If we are to have a just and lasting peace, it must be the creation of a sane realism, which has a clear vision of the moral law, a reverent acknowledgment of God its Author, and a recognition of the oneness of the human race underlying all national distinctions.

ATLANTIC CHARTER, WITHOUT EQUIVOCATIONS

We have no confidence in a peace which does not carry into effect, without reservations or equivocations, the principles of the Atlantic Charter. We feel, too, that it should provide assistance for prostrate nations in reconstructing their economic, social and political institutions.

If justice is compromised, if unreasonable concessions are made to might, grievances will rankle in the bosom of aggrieved nations to endanger the peace of the world. If prostrate nations are not assisted in giving to their peoples fair economic opportunities, they will become the arena of civil strife and turmoil. No international organization will be able to maintain a peace which is unfair and unjust.

There is an international community of nations. God Himself has made the nations interdependent for their full life and growth. It is not therefore a question of creating an international community, but of organizing it. To do this we must repu-

diate absolutely the tragic fallacies of "power politics," with its balance of power, spheres of influence in a system of puppet governments, and the resort to war as a means of settling international difficulties.

MIGHT MUST YIELD TO LAW

After the last World War an attempt was made to organize the international community. It failed not because its objective was mistaken but because of inherent defects in its charter, and more especially perhaps because the nations were not disposed to recognize their duty to work together for the common good of the world.

International law must govern international relations. Might must be subordinated to law. An international institution, based on the recognition of an objective moral obligation and not on the binding force of covenant alone, is needed for the preservation of a just peace and the promotion of international cooperation for the common good of the international community. The common good of every nation is inseparably connected with the common good of the international community.

The international institution must be universal. It must seek to include, with due regard to basic equality of rights, all the nations, large and small, strong and weak. Its constitution must be democratic. While it is reasonable to set up a Security Council

with limited membership, this council must not be an instrument for imperialistic domination by a few powerful nations. Before it every nation must stand on its rights, and not on its power. It must not allow any nation to sit in judgment in its own case.

Frankly, it must recognize that for nations as well as individuals life is not static. It must therefore provide in its charter for the revision of treaties in the interest of justice and the common good of the international community, as well as for the recognition of a people's coming of age in the family of nations.

The function of the international organization must be the maintenance of international peace and security, the promotion of international co-operation and the adoption of common policies for the solution of common economic, social and other humanitarian problems. In the maintenance of peace it is reasonable that the organization have at its disposal resources for coercing outlaw nations even by military measures.

In fostering and promoting international cooperation it must seek to guarantee to the weak and poor nations economic opportunities which are necessary to give their peoples reasonable standards of living, and must seek to prevent selfish monopolistic control of raw materials which are needed for the economic stability of other nations.

Effective international cooperation lays definite duties on favored nations. No nation may view with unconcern conditions that permit millions of workers in any country to be without the opportunity to secure from their labor adequate family support. Nations rich in natural resources must remember that ownership of property never dispenses with the social obligations of stewardship. Nations gifted with inventive and productive genius are obligated to serve the reasonable needs of other nations.

Nations should open, under effective guarantees, world lanes of commerce and world avenues of communication to all law-abiding countries. Protective national legislation for legitimate national economic interests must not impede the flow of international commerce and the right social function of international exchange.

TEETH FOR WORLD COURT

In the international organization there should be a World Court, to which justiciable disputes among nations must be submitted. Its authority should not be merely advisory, but strictly judicial. A condition for the right functioning of this court is the proper development and codification of international law.

Competent international authority must enact into positive law the principles of the moral law in their international references, and to these will be added positive treaty provisions

and the charter and legislation of the international organization.

The World Court should be empowered to render decisions in cases submitted to it either by any party in interest or by the international organization. It must have authority to refer its decisions to the international organization for execution.

It would be useless to set up a World Court and either deny it the right to demand the execution of its decisions or make the execution of them subject to the discretion of the international organization.

Nations which refuse to submit their international disputes which constitute a threat to the peace or the common good of the international community, should be treated by the international organization as outlaw nations. Moreover obligatory arbitration of international disputes which threaten world peace would mark a signal advance in international relations.

INSIST ON INNATE RIGHTS OF MAN

The international organization must never violate the rightful sovereignty of nations. Sovereignty is a right which comes from the juridical personality of a nation and which the international organization must safeguard and defend.

However, national sovereignty may not be interpreted as absolving a nation from its obligations in the international community. Moreover, even

within the State, national sovereignty is limited by the innate rights of men and families. Since civil authority does not confer these God-given rights, it may not violate them.

The ideology of a nation in its international life is a concern of the international community. To reject this principle is tantamount to maintaining that the violation of the innate rights of men in a country by its own government has no relation to world peace.

Just at this moment, in the interest of world peace, our nation is exerting itself to root out some ideologies which violate human rights in the countries we are liberating. We hold that if there is to be a genuine and lasting world peace, the international organization should demand as a condition of membership that every nation guarantee in law and respect in fact the innate rights of men, families and minority groups in their civil and religious life. Surely our generation should know that tyranny in any nation menaces world peace.

A nation which refuses to accord to its own people the full enjoyment of innate human rights cannot be relied upon to cooperate in the international community for the maintenance of a peace which is based on the recognition of national freedom. Such a nation will pursue its own

selfish international policies, while paying lip service to international co-operation.

FREE MEN, FREE NATIONS

We have it within our power to introduce a new era, the era for which peoples have been longing through the centuries, the era in which nations will live together in justice and charity.

It is a Christian hope we want to realize, the hope of a world at peace, a world of sovereign states cooperating in assuring all men the full enjoyment of their rights, a world of free men and free nations with their freedom secured under law.

War may come, but if our hope is realized it will be a war of punishment meted out to outlaw nations. Through all the sufferings and sacrifices of this war we have remembered and we recall today the words of our Chief Executive, written at its beginning:

"We shall win this war, and in victory we shall seek not vengeance but the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and of nations."

Issued by the Hierarchy of the United States at Washington, D. C., November 18, 1944.

A New Colonial Order

CHARLES KEENAN, S.J.

Reprinted from the **INTERRACIAL REVIEW***

ONE of the embarrassing things for many a white orator these days is that, when he has concluded a ringing peroration on the iniquity of the Nazi concept of a *Herrenvolk* and proclaimed the equality of all men, he hears a vast murmur of applause and agreement from every corner of the globe and from all kinds of people, black, yellow, red and brown. With some uneasiness he must reflect on the possibility that all these folk have taken him seriously and are, perhaps, waiting to see him put his principles into practice.

This is more than a possibility for a writer in the London *Economist* (quoted in the Foreign Policy Report of February 1, 1944), who urges the necessity of rapid development of colonial peoples towards self-rule, "if only because otherwise the demand for political freedom may gather such force that it has to be granted before the educational and economic basis for it has been established." We cannot hope to stem this rising tide by explaining in carefully chosen terms that there are *Herrenvolk* and *Herrenvolk* and that we are not as the nasty Axis *Herrenvolk*. There will surely be those among our hearers who will repeat to themselves some adaptation of Daniel Webster's saying: "They

mean to govern well; but they mean to govern. They promise to be kind masters; but they mean to be masters."

Our embarrassment is not relieved when we ask ourselves how the white man appears to the "inferior races." Aldous Huxley, in a bitter essay, recounts how he attended the showing of a Hollywood movie in Batavia. The natives, he said, sat silent as fish while the film unwound its seven soulful reels of sentimentality and promiscuity. As he went away through the still silent crowd, he wondered why they did not break out into a mad slaughter of the white inhabitants, yelling, "Why should we be ruled by morons?"

One answer, of course, was the white men had airplanes and machine guns. But that answer can scarcely have the same force since Pearl Harbor. Too many dark-skinned people have seen the white man humbled in the dust; and though the Japanese must surely fail in their attempt, human nature will always prompt the belief that this time *we* shall succeed.

This article is not meant as an attack on imperialism; that is a comparatively easy and unprofitable task. Saint Augustine knew and denounced the rapine and greed that had gone

* 20 Vesey St., New York 7, N. Y., July, 1944.

into the building of the Roman Empire; yet he dreaded the fall of that Empire as a world catastrophe. The Roman law, the Roman army, the Roman arch and the Roman road left their mark on Europe from London to Constantinople; and the result, by and large, was good. Rome gave to the people she conquered her own civilization; and through the Roman rule, in God's Providence, came Christianity and Western civilization.

The aim of this article is rather to stress the point that modern imperialism must justify itself in some such way as the Roman Empire did. It is rather to try to give a newer and more Christian idea of the "white man's burden." If that idea takes root, we may venture to think that political and economic problems existing between colonies and home governments will be so much the easier of solution.

SUPERIOR AND INFERIOR RACES

It is well to approach the question with a certain degree of salutary humility. We should ask ourselves just on what grounds we consider ourselves the superior race and speak of certain races as inferior. Gilbert K. Chesterton reminds us, in his *What I Saw in America*, that it is quite human to be interested in and even amused by the different customs of other peoples, but that we must not be betrayed into thinking them therefore inferior.

There is a vast difference, of course, between the cultivated European or

American and the Australian Bushman; but the proper comparison would be between the uncultivated European or American and the Bushman. If the white man had had to live in the black man's circumstances, or if the black man had had the white man's background and advantages, the comparison would be more enlightening. It may well be questioned if the average civilized man today really knows more than the aborigine. We live in a mechanical civilization and do not need to know so much. It is an interesting commentary on our knowledge that Allied soldiers in the Pacific are given instructions on how to keep alive if they find themselves cut off in the jungles. The Army is teaching them things that are almost second nature to the people who live in the Pacific islands. Our city-dwellers exist in a kind of vast machine, on which they depend for light, heat, food and sanitation; the aborigine has learned how to subdue his environment to his essential needs. We are today suffering from the fact that ability to make and use machines does not necessarily mean that men are more civilized; witness Pearl Harbor, Rotterdam and Lidice.

The point is not that the aborigines are better off without machines than we are with them, but that the record of our industrial age has not been such as to establish the thesis of our essential superiority.

We in America can be reasonably

proud of our development of democracy. We have arrived at a solution of the great problem of government—how to give power to govern without leaving the road open to abuse of that power. Our solution is not perfect, but it is one of the best yet arrived at. The complexity of our civilization renders the problem more acute; and we see from the example of the Axis countries that a large part of the white race has failed to solve it. The strong man who attempts to dictate to a tribe is much more vulnerable to an axe or an arrow in the hands of some disgruntled tribesman than is the dictatorial government of a large country. And Chesterton shrewdly suggests in *The Everlasting Man* that a tribal despotism is due less to the inherent power of the strong man than to the apathy and weariness of the people he governs. "It must not be supposed that it is easy to be free." Once again, the failure of a large part of the white races to cope adequately with problems of their own creation provides no comfort for the supporters of the theory of a white *Herrenvolk*.

Where the problems of an industrial society and organization of government are being most successfully met, they are being met and solved on a basis that rules out the white supremacy theory. Our American democracy rests solidly upon the fact that all men are created equal and that governments exist to protect their God-given natural rights. By adhering to

that principle we have kept our freedom and our democracy; by adhering to that principle we are working towards a state where the people are not swallowed up by the industrial machinery which should serve them. Where that principle is departed from—as in the treatment of the Negro and other racial minorities by certain of our citizens—there our democracy is in danger.

We have based our democracy solidly on the equality of men before God and before the law. Our "trusteeship" of the Philippines was something almost, if not absolutely, unique in the history of imperialism, because we made it our policy to export to the Philippines not merely the products of our industries but our own democracy; because we applied ourselves—with whatever incidental failures in performance—to the task of educating a subject people to freedom and of making them free as soon as we could.

The true "white man's burden" is the task of helping the peoples who now depend on him to attain to what is best in our western civilization. It is undeniable that in large sections of the world the people have not yet been able to draw from the earth those riches that are meant for all men. So long as that inequality persists, the task remains of trying to remove it. It is no simple or easy matter, being complicated by political, economic and historical factors. But the problem

does not solve itself by being ignored; and the white world is going to find that it cannot ignore it. During this war we have been preaching the blessings of equality and freedom too loudly to allow of our sitting back quietly when peace comes and forgetting all about them. The non-white world will not forget.

RESPECT FOR HUMAN PERSON

To quote again the Foreign Policy Report already cited: "Indeed the main question in the next half-century may not be 'Should colonies become independent?' but 'How will the rest of the world adjust itself to the rise of these new nations?' " What is most desirable, says the Report,

... is a gradual transition worked out in sincere cooperation by both sides. But the word "gradual" applies more properly to method than to time, for it is possible to have a truly gradual transition to independence in fifteen years—if the entire period is spent in constant preparation—and a sharp transition in fifty, if forty-nine years are devoted to holding on and the last one involves a break.

Naturally, there are peoples at all stages of development towards self-government and civilization. Some could profitably have it tomorrow; others may take half a century to reach it. The important thing is that the colonizing countries should not only practice what they have been

preaching about the equality of men but should believe it as well. The experience of the past decade has brought home to many what they should have known from Christian tradition—if they had not abandoned that tradition—that a country can be firmly and happily founded only on sincere respect for the human person, for every human person, as a creature of God. We must realize also that only on the same basis can the world be peacefully and fruitfully organized.

Doubtless there are many "undeveloped" races; but they are not therefore inferior, any more than a child is inferior because it does not understand calculus. The child, given the proper circumstances, can learn; and we regard it as our duty to the child to provide the circumstances and the means of learning. The modern State feels that a low literacy rate is a discredit; and every responsible citizen shares that feeling. So should a modern colony-owning country feel concerned if its colonies are not advancing as they should towards freedom; it should ask itself if it is properly fulfilling its trusteeship.

This is not to say that we set ourselves up as schoolmasters to the undeveloped peoples. On the contrary, we should be constantly aware of our own imperfections — an attitude which, if not acquired from reason or Faith, we may learn from the spectacle of the white world in the past few years. It was commonly urged, for

instance, that certain peoples were not ready for freedom, because they could not defend themselves. Just where that leaves France, Belgium, Holland, Norway and a number of other European countries is an interesting question. For it is worthy of note that Hitler divided the countries he wished to conquer and they fell into his lap one by one; whereas, if they had had sufficient foresight and concern for the common good, they would have stood together at the very first sign of aggression. Whether that lesson has really gone home is debatable, in view of recent political utterances and actions. When we start to teach political wisdom to the backward peoples, we shall do well to speak, like Saint Paul, "as one less wise." And let us not be surprised to find ourselves, at times, learning from them. While we

do not need to apologize for western civilization or its culture and achievements, it would be rather short-sighted to think that it is the only one. It has had the inestimable advantage of being leavened by a thousand years of Christianity; it will be interesting to see what Africa, India or China will produce when Christianity really makes an impact there.

The next half century will doubtless see the world faced by many hard and complicated problems arising out of the old—and, perhaps, new—empires. It would be naive to expect that good will and belief in human brotherhood alone can obviate all the difficulties in the transition from colonial status to independence; yet it is cold realism to recognize that these problems can never be solved if these fundamental concepts are ignored.



Catholic Communism

We Catholics, in every just cause, according to the demands of reason and the positive laws of God, can never stand aloof and we must collaborate with all. But when in doing so, one supports the teachings of Marx more than those of the Church; when, thereby, one takes into account neither what is being embraced nor what is being abandoned, and for the tyranny of one class is substituted that of another, then one so doing cannot be said to be acting as a Catholic.—*The Rev. Marino Cordovani in OSSERVATORE ROMANO, July 22, 1944.*

Family Life Threatened by Immorality

MOST REV. J. DUHIG, D.D.

HERE are on earth two institutions of which God is the author. The one is the Church: the other is the family. To elevate and sanctify family life Christ raised matrimony to the dignity of a Sacrament and commanded that what God had joined together no man was to put asunder. Thus did Christ give stability to family life and preserve its sacredness from being interfered with by any earthly power. He did so because the family is antecedent to society, and its rights and privileges are prior to any claims of civil governments.

It is from families that society is constituted, and in the last analysis society is what family life makes it. Good homes provide citizens alike for earth and for heaven, and without good homes there is no hope for pure and elevated community or national life. As parents have the first and most sacred responsibility for their children, so have they the first right to their children's allegiance provided that such allegiance does not conflict with the law of God.

St. Paul writing to the early Christians said: "Children, obey your parents in all things . . . for they watch as being to render an account of your souls." Ecclesiasticus says: "Hast thou children? Instruct them and bow down their neck from their

Sermon, delivered by the Archbishop of Brisbane, Australia, at St. Stephen's Cathedral, January 9, 1943.

childhood." (7, 25.) And in the Book of Proverbs we read: "My son, hear the instructions of thy father and forsake not the law of thy mother." (1, 8). St. Augustine complains of his father's neglect of his religious training in these words: "You did not care, father, how I grew up, or whether I would be chaste, if only I was eloquent."

Parents, therefore, have the tremendous responsibility of bringing up their children in the knowledge of God and in the keeping of His Commandments. It is they who have the right to educate and train their children or delegate that training to those who have authority to teach in the name of Christ. The Church shares with the parents the responsibility of bringing up their children, particularly in holiness of life and in practice of virtue. At the baptismal font Christ seems to say to the Church in the words of the daughter of Pharaoh concerning Moses: "Take this child and bring it up for me." The Church has abundantly provided for the carrying out of this duty through its teaching, through the facility it affords for the practice of

virtue, and through its system of Christian education to be found everywhere.

FAMILY LIFE SACRED

It is well in our day to emphasize the stability of the family and the importance of family life because never before in history were more inroads made on family life and the rights of parents than are being made in our day. Totalitarian States, Nazism and Communism are alike guilty of the crime of depriving parents of their rights over children and making the children chattels of the State. No one will deny the right of the State to have service from its citizens, but such service must not impugn either the rights of the parents or the claims of the Creator. To deny children the right to a religious education or to place such obligations on them as would conflict with their attendance at public worship on Sunday or with the practice of their religion in other respects, is to exercise a power which the State does not possess and which therefore becomes simply an abuse and a tyranny. This is exactly what is happening today in Nazi Germany and other countries.

The sanctity and permanence of family life is today threatened both from within and from without. It is in danger of dissolution and debasement sometimes from the parents themselves, who do not take the serious view which they should of their

duty of begetting and rearing children. The mother who has failed to prepare herself for this duty and who is more interested in social functions than in her home is not likely to bring up an ideal family. Likewise the mother who regards children as a burden is sure to fail to rear them properly.

The sacredness of family life has a powerful enemy in the men and women of our own time who have written novels or plays for the public and the cinema screen advocating more freedom for husband and wife and endeavoring to destroy the ideal of marriage sanctioned by the law of God and upheld for so many centuries by His Church and by Christian civilization. That civilization your irreligious modern novelist would paganize by striking at the sanctity and permanence of marriage and the stability of the home, and advocating not only easier terms of divorce for the married, but practically free love for married and single alike. With them fornication and adultery—sins which according to the teaching of Christ exclude from the Kingdom of Heaven—are only natural inclinations and weaknesses which must readily be condoned. That such writers can continue undisturbed their nefarious work and even attain popular notoriety, is one of the most potent signs of moral degeneracy in our age, which seems largely to have lost the spirit of Christian discipline particularly in matters relating to sex.

The man or woman who indulges in illicit love contrary to the sanctity of marriage is certainly weakening the family foundations. It is a common thing today to find families broken up by the illicit love of a husband and father for a woman other than his lawful wife. In this matter woman to woman can be very unjust, and in the category of the unjust certainly are the young women who associate with married men, are flattered by their attentions, and finally regard it as a triumph to take the men's affections from their wives. Excellent wives and mothers have in many instances to suffer the extreme humiliation of finding themselves rejected and their homes broken up by the unscrupulous women who have come between themselves and their husbands.

That to my mind is one of the most serious threats to the stability of family life and it is all the more dangerous because of the close association of the sexes in their daily avocations today. Unfortunately also there is no law to bring the erring husband to justice unless he commits bigamy. Otherwise he can continue his sinful associations and even live in concubinage by throwing a paltry pittance to his unfortunate wife and children. The latest phase of this scandal is that in certain circumstances the perfidious woman who has broken up the home can claim support from him.

Of course I know that there are

erring wives as well as erring husbands, and there are probably more of them today than ever before. Still, I think that the sin of the husband is the more widespread and greater evil, and it has been responsible for wrecking innumerable homes. It has always been to me an extraordinary contradiction that the law allows such illicit relations to go unpunished and the people guilty of them to go headlong to destruction, inflicting injury not only on the children that are ashamed of their evil lives, but on society at large.

Marriage is frequently entered into without the serious thought and preparation which should precede it. Young people fall in love, but it is a love often without a spark of spirituality. It is a love entirely physical, and when the physical attraction fails, such love easily perishes, ending in great unhappiness. We have at the present day quite an epidemic of these rash, ill-considered marriages and one does not need to be a prophet to foretell that a large percentage of them will end disastrously.

All this but shows us the wisdom of the Divine Commandments in regard to marriage and vindicates the Church that has so jealously guarded the sanctity and indissolubility of the marriage tie. Under the Old Law family life was guarded by precepts the breaking of which entailed public dishonor and even death. The father was regarded as the high priest of the

family and the children were to the parents a God-given charge which they loved with the whole strength of their being and cared for most jealously. The deathbed scenes described for us in the Old Testament generally show the father giving precepts of life and conduct to his sons, and the parents were everywhere held in honor by their children who rightly believed that disobedience to parental control would bring upon them the wrath of God. The Christian tradition about marriage and family life now so violently assailed is one of our greatest and most sacred heritages and we must be prepared to do everything in our power to preserve such a heritage from the withering blasts of disbelief and degeneracy.

AN APPEAL TO PARENTS

I appeal to you Catholic parents to preserve unsullied the sanctity of your marriage and to care for your children as the greatest gift that God has given you after the supernatural faith and the existence with which He has endowed yourselves.

Remember that of all the earthly possessions, you can look forward to having none in the next life except your children. Them you may hope to meet and have in Heaven, but only if you train them to love and serve

God on earth. Gather them round you evening by evening for the recital of the Rosary and other daily prayers, remembering the words of Our Divine Lord: "Wherever two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them." Have them by your side regularly at Mass and Holy Communion. You should strive for nothing more earnestly than for peace, happiness and union in your own homes, for outside the sanctuary where Christ dwells with us you should regard no place as more sacred than your family circle.

Whoever disrupts family life strikes a blow not only at the heart but at the very foundations of the nation, the moral fiber of which depends so largely on the character of its homes.

Guard, therefore, well your children. Keep them in love and obedience. Train them to lead good useful lives. Mould their characters on Christian morals and Christian principles and you will be doing a great service both to God and to the Nation. This is your supreme work. Fail not in it and you will leave to Church and country a heritage greater than any store of gold or silver. May the members of the Holy Family — Jesus, Mary and Joseph — bless and aid you in this all important work for which your reward will be exceedingly great in the Kingdom of Heaven.

Mr. Simple on Racial Equality

LOUIS J. HALLE, JR.

*Reprinted from THE SATURDAY REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

WHEN I came home this evening, my friend Harry Simple was ensconced in an easychair, a pamphlet open on his knees, a mug of beer at his elbow. I recognized the pamphlet as "The Human Races," by Dr. Benedict Weltfish Hooton Etalii, the latest in a series put out by the Citizens Committee for Education in Democracy. Dr. Etalii is, of course, the eminent anthropologist. The pamphlet had been sent me by a member of the Committee, who wrote that it was issued to combat Nazi racial doctrine, to promote better race relations between whites and Negroes, and to tell our soldiers abroad what they were fighting for.

"I have just been reading some of your subversive literature," Harry began, rapping the pamphlet with his knuckles. "I am surprised they allow this sort of thing in time of war."

"What are you talking about?" I asked.

"Why," he said, "this pamphlet maintains that objective scientific research has exploded the myths of racial superiority and has, on the contrary, conclusively confirmed the democratic doctrine of racial equality! 'Science demonstrates,' it says here, 'that there are no hierarchies of physical, mental,

or cultural ability in human races and no rank-lists of virtues and vices.'"

"Good!" I said, settling myself opposite him and pouring myself some beer. "It's about time somebody spoke out and told the truth."

"Far from being an objective scientific exposition of the truth, as it pretends to be," said Harry, "this pamphlet perpetrates an intellectual fraud on the long-suffering American public. It is downright dangerous."

"Look, Harry," I said. "I have just come in out of the rain, I have just had an argument with a bus conductor, things didn't go very well at the office today, and I am tired. But I will not sit here and listen to treasonable talk, if that's what you have in mind to try on me. I happen to believe in racial equality."

"It is precisely because I believe in it myself," he replied, "that I feel alarm at the nonsense perpetrated by its partisans in the name of science. What this pamphlet actually does is to undermine the doctrine of racial equality and prepare the ground for the exponents of racial supremacy."

"Rot!"

"This pamphlet," he continued, "is propaganda masquerading as objective science simply to overawe those who

might question it. I maintain that we shall not advance the cause of racial equality by masking the real logic that supports it with papier-maché arguments that are unconvincing because they are false."

"Professor Etalii," I said, "so far from being a fool or a fraud, as you imply, is one of our most distinguished living anthropologists."

"I will concede his distinction as a scientist," said Harry, "but as a philosopher he is an ignoramus, and it is a philosopher that is wanted here. Jefferson was a philosopher when he proclaimed that all men are created equal. I don't recall that anyone jumped on him because he had not first undertaken a scientific study of human beings, comparing their cephalic indices, their cranial capacities, their statures, and so on. If he had claimed equality on that basis, everyone would have laughed at him, and no one in his senses would have believed him. But that is exactly what your scientist is doing."

I am always at a disadvantage with Simple because, while my mind may be as good as his, it is not so quick. Having silenced me, he took a long draught of beer and proceeded more expansively.

"Dr. Etalii," he said, "had his mind on the combustible social issues involved in the relationship between whites and Negroes and in the Nazi assertion of Nordic supremacy. His unscientific passions were aroused by

those issues. However, scientific objectivity is claimed by him. We must therefore assume that he approached the problem without any preconception of the results he would obtain and without any wish to support a particular thesis or prove a particular point. We must suppose he was equally willing to discover that all races are equal, that Negroes are superior to whites, or that whites are superior to Negroes.

CANNOT EVALUATE DIFFERENCES

"Suppose, then, that after long and unswervingly objective research he precipitates a mathematically incontrovertible answer to the effect that races are not equal, that Nordics are distinctly superior to Mediterraneans, and that whites are superior to Negroes. He publishes these findings (if he can find a publisher) in a little book which is promptly blasted by every responsible reviewer in America. The outraged press takes up the cry on its front pages. He is charged with stirring up prejudice and superstition, with being a representative of the enemy, with defiling the fair name of science. Undoubtedly he is asked to resign from the university and, before a month is out, he has committed suicide."

"What the devil are you trying to prove by this nonsense?" I asked. "You are simply imagining a result he could not have obtained!"

"For the moment," he replied, "I

am not concerned with the result. I am merely drawing attention to the consequences any scientist might have to face if he attempted to be truly objective on such an issue. It is, of course, true that anthropological science by itself offers no basis for believing in racial superiority. But it offers no basis for precisely the same reason that astronomy and integral calculus offer no basis, simply because it is not competent in the premises. It is not competent to measure virtues or to weigh vices. The plain fact is that races differ, just as individuals do, and while science can define the differences it cannot evaluate them. Science can say that Tom is taller than Jack, but it cannot say that tallness is good in itself or that it makes Tom superior to Jack. It can likewise say the Shilluk Negroes are taller than the Hottentots, but it cannot say they are therefore better than the Hottentots."

"You have made my point for me," I said.

"However," he continued, disregarding my interruption, "to say that science cannot by itself assess values is not to say that values do not exist. For example, we can assume, if only on the basis of a general consensus, that it is better to survive than perish, and that it is therefore better to be strong than weak and better to be intelligent than to be an idiot."

"All right," I said, "let's put it that science bases its conclusions regard-

ing the equality of races on those agreed criteria."

I thought I had him there for a moment. "Very well," he said at last, "if you are going to believe in racial equality on those grounds you will be an easy mark for the exponents of racial supremacy. If you believe it is by virtue of their physical and mental attributes that men are equal, then the evidence of your own senses will not permit you to believe for long in human equality. It is the same with races. Objective science itself, if not the evidence of your own eyes, provides the refutation."

"Damn it all, Simple," I said, "objective science does no such thing! Say what you will, Dr. Etalii is a distinguished and reputable scientist. I think he has more claim than you to speak for science!"

"I have already pointed out," he replied, "that Dr. Etalii has, for the moment, stepped down from the pedestal of science to join the ranks of the wartime pamphleteers. But when on the difference, say, between the Onas of Tierra del Fuego and the Eskimos of the Arctic, he tells another story. I have attended his lectures and I know. In his classroom he teaches that the Eskimos are vastly superior to the Onas in the ingenuity with which they have met the challenge of a hostile environment, what with their igloos, their tailored fur garments, their use of sleighs, their sun-goggles to prevent snowblindness, and all the

rest. He shows how, by contrast, the Onas, also living in a wintry environment, shiver to death in a single un-tailored skin garment, and have no idea how to shelter themselves adequately from the weather. In that context he points out that the Onas are approaching extinction while the Eskimos are thriving."

I tried to interrupt, without success. "One could cite plenty of other instances from Dr. Etalii's objective teachings," he continued. "This same professor tells you that the Polynesians have possibly the finest physique of any people in the world, or he refers to the Lacandons of Central America as culturally degenerate. In his class on the Malayan region he attributes the displacement of the aboriginal pygmies by the invading Indonesians to the cultural, and perhaps to the intellectual and physical, superiority of the latter—yet no one therefore accuses him of preaching a subversive doctrine.

"However, the moment Professor Etalii emerges from the classroom and enters the field of social controversy, he swears in the name of science that such comparisons as he has just been making cannot be made at all. Despite what he has just been telling you of the Eskimo's superior culture and the Polynesian's superior physique, he now says science demonstrates that 'there are no hierarchies of physical, mental, or cultural ability'."

"Professor Etalii," I said, seizing

my chance at last, "would probably tell you that the difference between the Ona and the Eskimo was not a matter of race at all, that if you took an Ona infant and brought him up among the Eskimos he would, like as not, show himself just as clever as they."

EVIDENCE LACKING

"Speaking scientifically," Harry answered, "I should want some sort of evidence for that. I am sure that, if you raised a pygmy among giants, he would not grow up to be a giant on that account. His stature is a physical characteristic belonging to his race, and I see no reason to presuppose that psychological characteristics obey a different law. I should want evidence, and I am not aware that scientific research has provided any. In default of such evidence, it seems to me that we must judge peoples by their performance. In fact, it would be hard to explain on any other grounds the variations among races, in energy and intelligence, that history has demonstrated. History provides innumerable examples of races deteriorating in their vigor and being overwhelmed by races displaying fresh and superior vitality.

"Let me just cite one case," he continued, "as typical of many that would cast doubt on your theory. When the railways were first built through the Central American jungles, it was found that the native Indian labor

locally available was utterly inadequate to the task in point of strength and stamina. Consequently, Negro labor had to be imported from abroad to do the job. I have had the experience of visiting an isolated settlement in the innermost wilds of the Central American jungles and seeing a single Negro family there living cheek-by-jowl with the Indian families, eating the same food, and responding to the same immediate conditions. Anyone would have been impressed, as I was, by the contrast between the lethargy of the Indians, on the one hand, and the boisterous exuberance and vitality of the Negroes on the other. If this did not represent a basic racial difference—and I have seen the same thing elsewhere—then I say the burden of the proof is on those who deny it."

There was a pause after Harry stopped speaking. "Your argument," I said at last, "strikes me as irresponsible and extremely dangerous. I am glad there is no one else in this room to hear you."

"On the contrary," he replied, "it strikes me as extremely dangerous to rest the doctrine of human equality on the physical, mental, and cultural attributes of men, for by doing so you provide the enemy with a weapon he can use better than you."

"On what do you rest it?" I asked.

"All men are equal before their Maker," he said slowly. "All men are equal under the moral law. That is what Jefferson meant. That is what

Lincoln meant, for Lincoln actually did not believe in the physical equality of races and said so. The only sound basis on which one can ultimately rest the doctrine of equality is in the assumption that men are distinguished from the rest of the animal kingdom by the possession of souls, that their souls partake of the divine nature of their Maker, and that by virtue of their souls they stand outside the final judgment of their fellow men. This is true whether they are black or white, strong or weak, tall or short, rich or poor. If I deny your right to murder or enslave me, it is not because I am as strong and as intelligent as you, which perhaps I am not, and if I deny the right of the Eskimos to exterminate or enslave the Onas it is not because I think the Onas as strong and intelligent as the Eskimos. If only strength and intelligence were the test, then they would have to be proved in conflict. The English settlers who deliberately exterminated the savages on the island of Tasmania committed a crime, not because the Tasmanians were equal to them in cranial capacity, which they were not, but because they were presumably equal in the sight of God—or, if you will, before the moral law. Deny this moral basis for human equality, substitute cranial capacity or some other physical attribute, and you have not only committed an absurdity, you have cut away the only solid ground from under the doctrine of freedom and

democracy. Reason no longer forbids us to devour one another. This pamphlet, though Dr. Etalii did not intend it so, is a blow struck on behalf of the enemy against our democratic way of life."

We were both silent. "Simple," I said at last, "the trouble with you is you're an intellectual purist. The pamphlet may be propaganda, but we can't all be philosophers and perhaps

propaganda is what our poor minds need."

"You have less respect for humanity than I have," he replied, "and what you say has been better said by the Nazi apologists."

Harry Simple has an excellent brain, in my opinion, but he is not of this world. He is not well adjusted to his times.



Pope to South Africa

Only a century ago Africa was in great part an unknown and unexplored mystery. Today, who is unaware of the rugged grandeur and wealth of the African continent, and of your South Africa in particular? That wealth, created by God for the good of all, is a promise of material prosperity that should enable each and every one of your citizens to spend his life under conditions befitting his dignity as a man, and to rise also to those responsibilities and duties for which he is directly responsible to his Creator. But to ensure and safeguard these antecedent and inalienable rights of the individual, there are social and economic problems to be solved, all the more grave in a complex society such as yours. And We are sure that your leaders in Church and State are determined to face them with enlightened courage, and bring to their solution general comprehension and patient study. Wealth carries responsibilities, and national wealth carries national responsibilities.—*Pope Pius XII in a radio broadcast to South Africa, August, 1944.*

The Plain Man and the Peace

JOHN S. KENNEDY

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA**

THE typical plain citizen of the United States is concerned about the post-war world. He wants it to be prosperous. But, first of all, he wants it to be truly peaceful, for he knows that genuine prosperity depends on the existence of genuine peace. He wants no more war in his time. If anything he can do will effect a consummation so highly desirable, he wants the prevention of wars in the times of his children and his children's children as well. He has not suffered so much in this most terrible of blood-orgies as have the people of, say, Poland. But some of his family have gone out of the happy home circle into the murk and din of battle, perhaps never to return. Life as he knew it for decades is irretrievably altered: needless to say, for the worse. He is heavily taxed to finance the wasteful, destructive business of war. Papers, magazines, the radio, the movies deluge him with sickening evidence of murderous brutality into which humanity has sunk. He prays that those in responsible positions are doing all in their power to bring about an order in which the possibility of another such gargantuan slaughter will be scotched. He knows that he will have to pay for their failures.

He recognizes that the United States must take a greater part in world affairs so that the peace may be preserved. He realizes, too, what this entails: new obligation for our country, some degree of restraint on its freedom of action, a larger military establishment than ever before in peace-time and vast expenditure for its support, entailing onerous taxation. But, he says, if this is necessary to attempt the job, and, much more, if it actually does the job, it is worth the steep cost.

He realizes, moreover, that the maintenance of the peace depends chiefly on the great powers. They must agree and cooperate. This does not mean they are a law unto themselves, that the chief element in the peace is the imposition of their will. They must conform to demands of justice. They must respect the rights of all peoples. Their force must be moral as well as physical. At one time they gave evidence of understanding this latter necessity. They put their signatures to the Atlantic Charter. Of late their actions make the plain citizen wonder whether they have abandoned or conveniently forgotten or compromised the principles promulgated in that document as the basic

* New Haven 7, Conn., November, 1944.

law of the new order. Do they now suppose that what they want to do and are capable of doing, without regard to justice, can be the substance and the safeguard of peace? If they do, they are grievously wrong.

MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING

Nevertheless, the plain man thinks, there is justification for the belief that, although the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain cannot, now or ever, run the world to suit themselves, their getting along together is a prerequisite of that absence of serious friction essential to world tranquillity and reconstruction. He sees that the so-called Big Three must work in harness, that they must not be split asunder or drawn into war one with another. Hence the necessity of mutual respect and reciprocation of concessions. boastful and perhaps chauvinistic booster for America though he may be, he knows now that there are other big fellows, that they have made vast contributions to victory over the Axis, and that they are going to have a considerable voice in the running of the world. "So be it," he says, "I've learned the hard way, but I've learned."

One of the great powers whose achievements in the war he recognizes, and whose principal place in a new world order he takes for granted, is the Soviet Union. For years he has heard the Soviet Union extravagantly praised and unconditionally con-

demned. It was Utopia; it was hell on earth. He was told of the transfer of the great estates to the formerly downtrodden people, and he was told of the planned famines in which millions of these same people were liquidated. He read of the Soviet Constitution of 1936, "the most democratic in world history," and then again he read of the mode of voting in which but one candidate was on the ballot for every office and that one hand-picked by the single party which numbers only a tiny minority of Russians as members, yet holds all power. He was informed that the Soviet Union had a "people's government," yet he observed that Stalin was an absolute dictator and heard that view expressed by the President of the United States. And so he became highly sceptical of this remote, somewhat mysterious, entity.

At the start of the war, he saw it lining up with Hitler, sending him raw materials and transshipping purchases from the United States. He saw excerpts from the speeches of its Foreign Commissar in which the democracies were excoriated as aggressors in 1939 and Hitler's actions were warmly defended. He saw it strike at Poland on September 17, 1939, some three weeks after Hitler's assault on that country, making immeasurably easier the Nazi conquest and freeing Hitler's forces for the war in the West. He saw it divide Poland with the Germans and unleash a cam-

paign of terrorism and forcible sovietization on the Poles in the territory which it seized. He saw it gobble up Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and, by bludgeoning these little states, drag them against their will into the Soviet Union. He saw it attack Finland and cut away the most industrialized section of that small country.

Then he was witness to the end of Nazi-Soviet cooperation when Hitler invaded Russia. He learned of the prodigies of bravery performed by the Russians, of the punishment absorbed, of the savagery suffered, of the losses sustained without collapse, of the epic of Stalingrad, of the amazing turning of the tide thanks to Russian valor, military skill and productive wonders as well as to mountains of Anglo-American equipment and supplies and the victories of the United States and Britain in other theaters of war.

SHOTGUN MARRIAGE OF INTERESTS

He is convinced that victory will be the result of this alliance born of necessity, this shotgun marriage of interests. He abhors the notion that Britain and the United States must or will one day fight the Soviet Union. He wants no such war. He cries out against it. He looks on the prospect as suicidal. He does not approve of the Soviet system, yet he repudiates the suggestion that we have the duty of setting it right by exercise of arms. It cannot be done, he maintains, and the very idea makes him angry.

He hopes, then, for effective long-term cooperation by his country and Britain with the Soviet Union. But he is not sure either that it has come into being or that it will. His doubt is prompted by what he knows of the Soviet system and the course pursued by the Soviet Union from the very start of the circumstance-induced coalition against the Axis. When he attempts to voice his doubt, in order to air his views and, if possible, to get reassurance, he meets with reproaches and even abuse. He is charged with stupidity, reactionary-mindedness, fascist sympathies, and addiction to prejudice and ignorance. He is not answered but shouted down. He bridles at such treatment. He is not cowed by it, much less is he convinced. For he knows that he has ample reason for his misgivings. They are based on the record.

He knows, first of all, that the Soviet system is totalitarian. It was totalitarian from its inception and its nature has not been changed. Authority and initiative came entirely from above, not from below. The czars never had concentrated in their hands the power which is Stalin's. Some of the secondary trappings of democracy have been draped over the Soviet absolutism. Apologists for the Soviet Union argue that, given the outward show of democracy, the reality must inevitably follow. But the plain American knows that this is not so. He knows that a cake does not auto-

matically produce itself once one has a cake-tin.

During the war there has been much wishful thinking about the transformation of the Soviet system, the mitigation of its totalitarianism. But the reality remains unchanged. The accent on old-fashioned patriotism, rather than on Marxism, has been opportunistic. Stalin has been at pains to state more than once that Russia remains Marxist. If anything, the war has given the dictatorship a stronger, more penetrating grip on the country than it ever had before. The concessions (such as the straitly qualified toleration of religion) which the most firmly entrenched dictator must, during a crisis, make to the people in minor matters, do not weaken his dominion, much less do they transform him into a constitutional executive answerable to the popular will in major matters. Actually, all life continues to be regulated by Stalin. The secret police have not been disbanded. Freedom of speech and of the press has not been granted. The state's monopoly of education has not been dissolved. Independent labor unions have not made their appearance. And so forth.

WHAT BOTHERS THE PLAIN CITIZEN

But why should all this bother the plain citizen of the United States? For several reasons.

First, he has been ceaselessly told that the world simply cannot function

half totalitarian and half free. He has had it dinned into him that totalitarianism is irredeemably evil, that it represents injustice and tyranny canonized, that it tends to spread, that it ineluctably breeds war.

Secondly, there is the question of the grounds on which the Soviet Union and the Western Allies will meet after the war and during the peace. These will not always be pragmatic military grounds, but social, political and economic. For example, Germany is to be divided into three zones of occupation, one assigned to each of the Big Three. There will be, in each, a military government and, presumably, the development, under its auspices, of some form of local self-rule. Will the Soviet military government sponsor, can it even tolerate, any kind of democratic local government? Hardly. What, then, of the effect of this on the occupied people in the contiguous zones held by the forces of the democracies? What of the agreement on major policy lines which must exist among the chief administrators of the several zones?

Thirdly, the peace, we are told, is to be a peoples' peace. For it to work, the peoples must be acquainted with one another. How much do the people of Russia know of us? Do we have free access to them? Can we inform them about ourselves? Will the tight Soviet censorship be abolished in accordance with the proposals for

uninhibited circulation of information which are now being made? Does either the Soviets' flat denial of any approximation of freedom of movement to American correspondents and high military and diplomatic personnel or the virtual quarantine of the crews of Russian ships touching at our ports, seem to portend unconditioned intercourse? Certainly not.

Again, the plain American believes that, if the peace is to be enforced by mutual effort, it must be formed by mutual agreement. He has been patiently taking a vast deal of lecturing about the concessions which his country must make in order to guarantee the existence and permanence of the peace. The tone and the volume of this harangue have perhaps been inspired by the fact and the degree of enduring isolationism in this country. But your average citizen is now convinced of the indispensability of a viable world organization, with the United States playing its proper part.

Even so, he cannot understand the idea that all the reformation and all the concession must be made by his country "Why is the fault all ours?" he asks. "Why must we alone go to the mourners' bench and indulge in an orgy of breast-beating? Are we the sole menace to world peace? Are our sins of omission the only sins of omission, and are there no sins of commission on the part of others? Is the peace reducible to a simple affirmative answer to the question: 'Is the United

States ready to underwrite any kind of agreement among the Big Three'?" And any kind of agreement among the Big Three seems to be the formula.

What disturbs the plain man is the fact that the Soviet Union is making, and has been making, dangerous unilateral decisions which are to be automatically incorporated in the new order that the United States is expected to maintain and defend.

THE CASE OF POLAND

Poland is a case in point. Poland has the right to exist. Europe needs Poland. The original Allies took up arms in defense of that right and need. To destroy Poland is to work a gross injustice which will prevent real peace in Europe and, hence, in the world. The Polish question is not simply a minor local question. It has universal implications. But it is being settled as if it were the exclusive affair of the Soviet Union.

By a curiously slanted and selective appeal to history, it is argued by the Soviet Union that a great part of Poland is its property and the rest its fief. It means to have and to hold its purported property. What is done to the Poles in that territory is nobody's business but the Soviets'. If expropriation, transportation, the denial of religious freedom, the suppression of educational institutions, etc., are decreed for the Poles, they concern no one but Stalin. As for the rest of Poland, it is to be made completely

dependent on and amenable to the Kremlin, this under the pretence of establishing democracy. Its nominal government will be in the hands of puppets. Its precarious existence is to be still more hedged about with insecurity by the annexation of a wide slice of German territory which will carry the borders of the captive Polish state to within thirty miles of Berlin. This will guarantee the lasting enmity of the Germans and the consequent enslavement of a wobbly Poland to the Soviet Union.

This is Stalin's purpose. It has been relentlessly pursued through the blackest days of the war, regardless of justice, regardless of the Poles' huge contribution to victory, regardless of the objections of Britain and the United States. The legitimate Polish government in exile has been treated as if it were a gang of criminals, with less leniency, indeed, than has been extended to the German despoilers of Russia. No independent Polish army has been allowed a part in the liberation of its homeland. The scandal of Warsaw's heroic fight, after some thirteen appeals for such a fight from Moscow-controlled radio, and its virtual annihilation with the Red Army looking on passively a few miles away, is another evidence of the Soviet determination that no Poles save those who serve Moscow's interests can be allowed to contribute anything to the expulsion of the Nazis.

All this gravely disturbs the plain

American. As he sees Stalin taking a wholly independent line and presenting this country and Britain with a succession of accomplished and immutable facts of which they have not been informed in advance and of which they do not approve, he asks, "Is this close cooperation? Is this mutual confidence? Is this give and take?" He wants to know if the pattern of the peace is for us to accept unquestionably whatever decisions Moscow makes and pledge our unstinting assistance in putting them into effect and making them stick. "If we are responsible for enforcing the peace," he says, "we have every right to a voice in framing the particulars which we shall have to vindicate. It is not common sense to sign a blank check. It is ruinous to buy a pig in a poke at inflation prices."

The plain American had high hopes when the Dumbarton Oaks conferences began. They were deflated as the first phase of the discussions dragged on and its accomplishments became known. It was announced that ninety per cent of agreement had been achieved. The ten per cent of disagreement practically cancelled the ninety per cent, for it had to do with the right of any one of the Big Three to vote on a question involving aggression perpetrated by itself. Britain and the United States wanted it to be the rule that no one of the Big Three (or Four or Five) on whose action judgment was being passed, might veto

the decision of the others. But the Soviet Union insisted that a state whose action was up for scrutiny, should have the decisive voice in the official review of its own case. In other words, each great power is to be a law unto itself, to enjoy the benefits but not pay the costs of collective security. Thus the very object of any new league would be aborted at the start. Thus, too, it becomes clear that the Soviet attitude to any new league would duplicate its attitude toward the old League: that is, aloofness until, in 1934, the Nazified Reich and Japan began to threaten Russia and Litvinov cried for collective security.

HOSTILITY NOT ONE-SIDED

Stalin's stand at Dumbarton Oaks was evidently motivated by his determination that no check should be put on any course (regarding Poland, for example) which he might choose to pursue. But his apologists in our midst have tried to tell the plain American that it resulted from the Soviets' justified suspicions of the sincerity and good intentions of the Western Allies on the basis of their past performance. It is alleged that the West has always been hostile to the Soviet.

But the plain American knows that any hostility between the West and the Soviet Union is not a one-sided affair. He remembers that the Soviets came to power in Russia vowing destruction of the existing order in

every other country. They made no secret of their intention of overthrowing established forms of government wherever possible, and of setting up universally the dictatorship of the proletariat with headquarters in Moscow. They did all that they could to carry out their plans. They had agents in every other country. These recruited thousands whose first loyalty was to the Kremlin and who worked fanatically for the interests of the Soviet Union and, if need be, against those of the country of which they were citizens. This program, never actually abandoned despite pious disclaimers, was scarcely calculated to inspire confidence and good feeling on the part of people who wanted no part of the Soviet system.

Furthermore, the plain American is confronted right now with ample evidence of the Soviet Union's taking a strictly private line in country after country, through the instrumentality of local Communist parties. These are supposedly autonomous units, with no connection whatever with Moscow, uncontrolled by, and, indeed, out of touch with, the Kremlin.

The plain American knows that this is so much disingenuous nonsense. He has seen Communist groups go through all kinds of superficial transformations, but remain always precisely the same, always the tool of Stalin. He remembers that the American Communists sought to balk all defense measures and to disrupt Amer-

ican rearment prior to the day on which Hitler struck at Russia, and then immediately began to clamor for an instantaneous declaration of war by the United States. He notes that, at present, the watchword of the American Communists is Teheran, presumably, because at Teheran the other Allies agreed to let Stalin do as he liked in eastern Europe.

COMMUNISTS IN ITALY

He observes the Communist tactics in Yugoslavia, in Greece, and in Italy. The Communist record in Italy is of especial interest to him. He is not at all sure that his own country and Britain have acted wisely, or even intelligently, in Italy, but the course there of the third of the principal Allies he finds productive of serious worry.

The Soviets' acceptance of Marshal Badoglio and even seeming benevolence to the discredited king, he has seen as but a way of stalling until either the industrial north, with its more numerous Communists, should be cleared of the Nazis, or the agents sent into Italy by the Soviet Union could do what was required to put the Communist Party, subservient to Moscow, in a dominant position.

To date, the American who simply reads the newspapers has seen the latter line skillfully worked out. Palmiro Togliatti, an Italian Communist with many years of life in the Soviet Union behind him, returned to Italy

at an early stage of its liberation and got busy. He had an astonishing amount of money, in Italian lire, at his disposal. The Communists, under his direction, joined the coalition government. They were in no position yet, and the time was not ripe, to take over the government.

But they had a plan. They made effusively friendly overtures to the Christian Democrats, who had emerged from the limbo of Italy's slavery to the Fascists in surprising strength and numbers. The Christian Democrats came nearest to having a majority, hence were to be temporarily courted. The Communists sponsored an organization known as the "Catholic Communists." This last was one of those tactics of confusion of which the Communists are masters. It suggested that there was no incompatibility between Catholicism and Communism. Italy's misery might incline the masses to Communism, but their Catholicism would keep them from joining or following the party unless, at least for a time, the impression could be given that one might be simultaneously a Catholic and a Communist.

Combined with this clever maneuver was a series of rumors, sedulously planted in the press, that a rapprochement between the Vatican and the Kremlin was imminent, that negotiations were in progress, that Stalin had sent a letter to the Pope, etc. The Vatican promptly denied all these idle

tales as often as they sprang up, but the effect of their carefully timed repetition was to mislead the generality into supposing that considerable substance attached to them. The Pope and other high churchmen denounced the "Catholic Communist" movement, labelling it an impossible hybrid, a monstrosity. But meanwhile it had served its purpose in alienating from the Christian Democrats their most leftist members. Then, when the necessary groundwork had been done, a kind of coalition of Nenni's Socialists and Togliatti's Communists was announced.

Experience has shown that such a combination is always dominated and manipulated at will by the Communists. In this instance the coalition gave them a voting majority in any government to succeed the unpopular, unstable, and ineffective Bonomi cabinet. Street fighting broke out between the Communists and the Christian Democrats. Gangs of the former beat up groups of the latter. Moreover, the Communists began to move into the former Fascist headquarters in various communities, taking over the offices of the several Fascist organizations, and not simply for the purpose of airing the premises and destroying all Fascist trappings and records.

The plain American, seeing all this, asks, "What goes on? Is Italy to become Communist? Is it to be a dependency of Moscow, nominally sovereign but run by men who take their

orders from Stalin? Is there to be no free government in Italy? Have the Italians been relieved of Mussolini's dictatorship (at incalculable cost in suffering and destruction), simply to be handed over to a dictatorship of another color? Can there be any peace in Italy if the Communists prevail? Will the Italians accept such a regime? Will there not be restiveness and civil war? Will not these spread across the frontiers into the rest of Europe, a single, though varied, unity as it is? What of the fate of the Catholic Church in Italy, numbering all but the smallest fraction of the population as its members? What of the effect of the Church's lot in Italy upon the millions of Catholics throughout the rest of Europe and the world? Will there not be grave disaffection and disturbance? Will not the peace be jeopardized? Yet we are expected to contribute heavily toward the maintenance of that peace in the making of which the Soviet Union is going its own way."

NO SUBSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

It is little wonder that the plain American is disquieted by the kind of peace which, despite an almost total blackout of vital information, he can decry coming to birth. He feels that the makers of the new order may have outsmarted themselves. He credits his government with honest intentions. He has a stubborn confidence in its dedication to achieving a peace of

justice. He realizes how difficult it is to cope successfully with such a complex of vexatious problems as this involves, while fighting a tremendous war. He knows that this country cannot dictate to its Allies, overrule them, make them toe its line. Nevertheless, what is happening and what is logically to be expected from present premises strike him as mistaken and perhaps calamitous. He had hoped for a peace so equitable that it would have strongly recommended itself to the millions of men the world over who, after these decades of military, economic and political warfare, are long-

ing desperately for a just and stable order.

The plain American has the wit to perceive that, once the standard of justice is abandoned, no combination of powers having among them a monopoly of force can be substituted for it as the guarantor of peace. This is anarchy under a semblance of uniformity. The police in one's city are not the law or do not even make the law. Subject to it themselves, they merely enforce it. If the law is lacking, the police fall out one with another and are powerless to prevent chaos in the community.



Progressive Education

This plan of action or rather non-action (*i. e.* progressive education) would, in its extreme form, first of all deprive the child of his intellectual, social and spiritual inheritance and put him back in the Garden of Eden to begin all over again the life of civilized man. He must be asked to do nothing which he does not like to do. He must be taught nothing which he does not choose to learn. He must not be subject to discipline in good manners and sound morals. In other words, he must be let alone to do what he likes in this amazing twentieth century in order that what has been called his individuality may grow naturally and without guidance or discipline.—*Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler in The New York TIMES, September 28, 1944.*

THE EDITORIAL MIND

The Election

WELL, it's all over and the shouting. We say "and" with a purpose, for it seems that one of the "musts" in every political campaign is a large order of verbosity. Many words were spoken by both candidates and their adherents that could just as well have been left unsaid. In every presidential election, charges and counter-charges are hurled with a looseness that almost overwhelms. Names are called that in times of less emotional stress and strain would shatter the libel laws. Sinister whispers, ill-founded rumors, innuendoes and half-truths, all have a field day.

Nevertheless, whether a man voted for Mr. Roosevelt or for Mr. Dewey, the fact that we held an old-fashioned presidential election on time and in regular procedure is something for which we should all thank God. It could have been otherwise. We did not fear civic strife; we enjoyed a secret ballot; we had a free choice; every citizen had an equal opportunity, and an example was set over which the whole world might meditate with profit.

The die has been cast but much

remains to be done. We have participated in an election that was possible only because Fascism and Communism are still foreign evils. Let every American support the President wholeheartedly and pray God's blessings on his administration. — *The MONITOR, San Francisco, November 11, 1944.*

Church Unity Octave

WE are now engaged in a week of very commendable effort to advance the Kingdom of God upon earth. In recent years it has become customary to set aside the week which begins with the feast of St. Peter's Chair in Rome and ends with the Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul to revive the spirit of these two great Apostles in Catholic hearts and seek to increase the number of adherents to the one true Church.

The prayer that all may be one should be fervently offered to God these days and each member of the Church should realize his own private, personal responsibility for making God better known and better loved. If all of us would equip our minds to be salesmen for Christ, regulate our conduct so as to become imitators of

Christ, become aware of many of our neighbors' great need of Christ, many additions would be made to the fold of the Good Shepherd.

How many Catholics there are who die and must go before God with the admission that they have never done a thing to spread His saving truths, never been responsible for leading a single soul to Him. During Unity Octave week and all the weeks that follow let us pray, let us set good example, let us take interest in the men of good will among our non-Catholic neighbors, let us become ardent supporters of the great missionary efforts which are securing so many conversions, so that we can go to God with evidence that the Faith in us has borne fruit. — *The CATHOLIC MESSENGER, Davenport, Iowa, January 20, 1944.*

Another Change of Front?

THE Pope's broadcast on September 1, in which the right of property was stressed in plans for world reconstruction, was welcomed, strangely, by the local Communist press. The Holy Father's statement that "property has not an unlimited right" and that social policy must "encourage and guarantee the small and medium proprietor in agriculture, industry and commerce," was printed in bold type. The whole tone of the report seemed to indicate approval. Is this another Communist change of

front? "It is welcome," continued the Communist *Guardian* (September 6), "in that it does not concentrate its attack on Socialism nor does it contradict those Communist programs, such as the French and the Australian programs, which call for the nationalization of monopolies."

There was nothing new, of course, in the Pope's broadcast. He merely reaffirmed the Christian social principles laid down long ago by his predecessors. Nor have the Popes ever contradicted, as the *Guardian* implied, the nationalization of monopolies. As Pius XI laid down in the Encyclical, *Quadragesimo Anno*, "it is rightly contended that certain forms of property must be reserved to the State, since they carry with them an opportunity of domination too great to be left to private individuals without injury to the community at large."

On the other hand, the Popes have consistently condemned Socialism, because one of its cardinal principles is the denial and abolition of property and the Holy Father's broadcast was precisely directed against Socialist planning of a new world order.

The implied suggestion of the *Guardian* article, that the Pope has changed Catholic social teachings, is, therefore, absurd, and the subtlety of its concluding paragraph is in its best propaganda tradition. "The statement," concluded the *Guardian*, "indicates that the Vatican is already feeling the force of the new demo-

eratic movements that are sweeping through Europe." The truth is that it is not the Pope who is changing Catholic social doctrine, but the *Guardian* that is modifying its ideas on property, in response, presumably, to the drift from Marxism in Soviet Russia.—*The ADVOCATE, Melbourne, Australia*, September 13, 1944.

Farms for Servicemen

"RURAL life in all its phases must play an important part in the solution of this social war," Bishop Joseph Schlarman said in an address to the National Catholic Rural Life conference in Cincinnati this week. "It is estimated that some 50 million people in this country are today employed either in the armed forces or as war workers. The Rural Life offers a solution after the war. It is evident that these millions cannot find employment in industry and in the city. Large numbers must be channeled off to the rural areas. We must fight for the family type farm and family-owned farms as against corporation farming, if we are not to find ourselves in the same difficulties as countries with a few large and immensely wealthy landowners. Capitalist corporation farmers are parasites that fatten on the land."

Unfortunately in too little of the talk about the solution of post-war economic problems is mention made of agriculture. Elaborate blue-prints

are prepared by industrial concerns and comprehensive surveys made by Chambers of Commerce. All of these are needed. However, the pieces of the very complicated jig-saw puzzle of reconversion to a peace time economy will not be solved unless the farmer and his needs from, and his contributions to, society are taken into account.

The National Catholic Rural Life conference continues to insist on this point. As Catholics we should be aware of and willing to follow its leadership. — *CATHOLIC HERALD CITIZEN, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, November 18, 1944.*

Need for Education

IN adult life, continuous education is necessary if the rank and file are to have a chance at all at maintaining their economic and civil rights. This is a vast new field as yet almost untouched. The use of many technical inventions and science requires that people band together in associations. The age of voluntary association is here. To learn how to work together and select leaders and managers to administer socially-owned property is now a necessary function if we are to remain part of a free world.

Then, there is education in its deepest and widest sense. The great lights of Christianity have always insisted that education is more than instruction. Its deepest meaning is to draw

out the good and develop it to its highest end. It involves not only the intellect but the will. The art of arts, according to the seekers of Wisdom, is the discipline of the soul.

The world is well supplied now with well-informed barbarians and even clever fools. Even a writer like Lewis Mumford—who is not a Christian—states that it is our technical knowledge in this age that will destroy us. This wise admission from such a source is news—because for a long time anyone who did not bow down in superstitious awe before science and machinery was looked upon as a religious reactionary longing for the Middle Ages.

Education has, in our time, become synonomous with getting ahead in this

world, has been drawn into the current of the rapids of progress in complete ignorance of what Christopher Dawson warns against (in four or five books)—that evil is also progressive in the modern world—and that anyone who believes entirely in keeping up with the Joneses is certain to keep up with the Devil.

What the Christian must assert in education is, above all, a knowledge of the nature of man, an understanding of his destiny, a scale of values and a sense of direction, and a success ideal that is based on these fundamentals. Otherwise, all is out of joint; and man himself becomes, in the course of time, nothing more than a big consumer of energies to serve demonic fires.—*The CASKET, Antigonish, N. S., November 9, 1944.*



Christian Fortitude

Whoever lives by the spirit of Christ refuses to let himself be beaten down by the difficulties which oppose him, but on the contrary feels himself impelled to work with all his strength and with the fullest confidence in God. He does not draw back before the straits and the necessities of the moment but faces their severity ready to give aid with that love which flees no sacrifice, is stronger than death, and will not be quenched by the rushing waters of tribulation.—*Pope Pius XII in SUMMI PONTIFICATUS.*

Are Children Necessary?

THE EDITOR

*Reprinted from BETTER HOMES & GARDENS**

THE young fellow who lives in the little house with the vines on the porch used to be quite a "stepper." He didn't change his ways much when he married his little redhead. Nor, for that matter, did she. Her bright mop of hair was a danger signal, all right.

That marriage seemed headed for a big fight and the divorce court for a while. We all felt sorry about it. Somehow, we all knew that both youngsters were fundamentally sound.

We don't worry about this couple any more. There are three in that family now. The little fellow with his mother's red hair and his father's chin and eyes has taken charge. His mother lives every moment for his comfort and welfare. His father is thinking, not about an evening with the "boys," but away off in the future—about the kid's schooling, about the sort of country and the sort of world in which the lad will live some day.

Yes, that couple's tied down, all right, tied down to a job that will last for a quarter of a century. It takes that long to raise a family.

The funny thing is, they don't seem to mind. In fact, the strain has gone from their faces, and you can see happiness there.

A long time ago it was said that if one wished to save his life, he would have to lose it. Young people cannot understand that saying, which seems so foolish. But parents can understand. They know that sacrifice is enlightened selfishness. They know that it is the road to happiness; that satisfaction with one's life is not complete so long as one labors only for himself. In a way that we can feel but cannot understand, we know that we become complete only through our children.

Thinkers have sat alone in their quiet studies and have reflected on the folly of bringing unasking children into a world of strife and evil. Because this is a world of strife, shot through with evil, their arguments sound plausible.

But is this the whole picture? Isn't life, just for the fun of it, and in spite of its inevitable sorrows and disappointments, worth while? Isn't there something that tells us with a certainty at least equal to the conclusions of intellectual pessimism, that we know so little about life that

* 420 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y., October, 1944.

we should listen to the dictates of the heart with no less attention than we give to the conclusions of reason? Isn't there always the future beckoning, asking the human race to come and see it? To see it, and to see how different it is from the past?

Yes, happiness lies in conforming to the rules of life, and the first of these rules is that we shall lose our lives in the lives of our children. Perhaps there is not much more needed in a recipe for happiness. *Perhaps those who are willfully childless are missing more of the real vital core of life than they can know.*

Put it to the proof. Ask a parent if he wishes his child had not been born. Look at the amazed stare which answers you.

Life is growth. We ourselves grow right along with our children until the day of our death, though they then, too, be old, as they press our hand in the final farewell.



Neo-Fascist Catholic Press

A new daily paper is appearing in Cremona under the auspices of Farinacci, called *Crociata Italica*. The first number is dated January 10, and it has already been condemned in unequivocal terms by the Bishop. It is edited by Don Tullio Calcagno, who was formerly (but is no longer) parish priest at Terni Cathedral. The other priests associated with it are Don Angelo Scarpellini, of Bologna; Don Remo Cantelli, of Turin; and Don Zago, of the Santuaria di Fontanellato near Parma. All these are contributors to Farinacci's *Regime Fascista*.

Giovanni Papini is among the contributors to a new weekly that is appearing in the enemy interest: *Italia e Civiltà*, which is published at Florence. Another is the extremely "popular" *Italia Cattolica*, of Venice.

These new publications were necessary because so few existing Catholic periodicals could be found in German-occupied Italy to serve the German cause.—*The London TABLET*, February 5, 1944.

Religious Unity

V. REV. JOSEPH FENTON, S.T.D.

*Reprinted from the LAMP**

WE must consider the subject of religious unity realistically. There is one God, the Creator and Lord of heaven and of earth, eternal and immutable, infinitely wise and just and merciful. The evidence for His existence and His attributes is clear and scientifically unimpeachable. Religion is nothing more or less than the process of rendering to that God the service and recognition clearly due to Him. It is His will that all of us should join together in this service. Thus Church Unity is more than some visionary benefit which men seek of their own accord. It is something God commands, and thus an object which every man who wishes to serve God should seek to accomplish.

In the 85th Psalm we read: "All the nations Thou hast made shall come and adore before Thee, O Lord: and they shall glorify Thy Name." Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ made it abundantly clear that He wished those who loved Him to worship together. "And other sheep I have that are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." (John 10, 16). The evangelist, St. John, testified that

Our Lord died "not only for the nation (of the chosen people) but to gather together in one the children of God that were dispersed." (John 11, 52). It was the prayer of Christ to His Eternal Father "That they all may be one, as Thou Father in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." (John 17, 21).

Christ meant a definite kind of religious unity. "I in them and Thou in Me: that they may be made perfect in one: and the world may know that Thou hast sent Me, and hast loved them as Thou has loved Me" (John 17, 23). A common worship involves a common belief about God, the acceptance of the same divine message. It involves a love of God which manifests itself in a genuine affection for our fellow men and a willingness to associate in the work of religion with all of those who are called with us to live as brothers and sisters of Jesus Christ. Where there is diversity of worship there is either some error about God or about His message or there is that discord which stands in the way of God's love. Since religious division is founded either on error or on hatred, men who seek truth and

* *Graymead, Garrison, N. Y., November, 1943.*

who also wish to love their fellow men in God will turn towards religious unity.

TRUTH MUST PREVAIL

In the matter of Church Unity truth must prevail. Unless we are willing to cast aside the worship of God as an affair of mere personal whim, and consequently as a thing of no value in our lives, we must focus our minds upon the fact that it is a matter of truth. There is a definite message from God to man, a message which He commands us to believe. And He has given us sufficient indication that this doctrine actually is what it claims to be. If we are sincere in our love for God, and sincere in our desire for human concord, we shall examine the content of God's message to us in order to find what He desires us to do. We must approach that message, not in the spirit of partisan contentiousness, but with a scientific hunger and thirst for truth. If we make this approach, God will bring us together.

Partisan prejudices, the outworn conventions and traditions of men which now as before tend to obscure the outline of God's teaching, stand in the way of Church Unity. It is our business and our privilege to put aside these obstacles and to show that we love the truth above our own pride. The truth we seek is the Will of God. We wish to know what God wishes us to believe and to do in the matter of religion. The exercises of

the Church Unity Octave will aid materially in bringing about this true service of God.

There may be some who will think that the work of Church Unity is something far too difficult to be really practical. Frankly we do not share this pessimism. We know the infinite power of God. Moreover, we know that the times in which we live call successfully for the abandonment of old prejudices and old errors. Suffering has a way of making men realists, sometimes in spite of themselves. This is the acceptable time to move towards that religious unity which God has commanded and which His children so badly need.

From our allies in England comes word that both the Catholic and the Anglican communions are working for the effectiveness of the Church Unity Octave. They have seen too much of suffering and death to allow the errors of long ago and some objectively ridiculous social prejudice to stand in the way of their service of God. We know that Americans will be fully as realistic. We must be willing to cast aside all the mistakes and all the antipathies which keep us from a full and effective service of our God.

However, we must not allow ourselves to forget that our quest for Church Unity must itself be intensely realistic. We shall not unite effectively to work for God on some negotiated compromise calculated to preserve our own whim and our own

outworn social attitudes. We unite effectively for God only when we observe His directions to the letter, subordinating all of our prejudices to His truth. In this spirit we shall achieve the goal we seek.

The Church Unity Octave was conceived in this spirit. The distin-

guished founder of the Society of the Atonement, the late Reverend Paul James Francis, organized this work in order to bring men together effectively before the altar of God. The Society which carries on his work continues to lead in directing these exercises towards the understanding and the love of God's word.



Europe and the Church

To the American troops who have had their military training in Southern England the similarity of Normandy must have been most striking. In Normandy as in all parts of France the church is the center and focus of village life; and since the first days of the Allied landing it has been apparent in France, as it was also in Italy, that the local church and clergy were the center to which everyone turned in times of distress.

That indeed has been one of the first lessons which have struck many observers in the first renewal of contact with liberated Europe. And it has been not the least bond between these peoples and their liberators that so many of the armed forces arriving to take part in expelling the German invaders have been of their Faith, accompanied by their own Catholic chaplains. The proportion of Catholics among the Canadian forces is higher than that in any part of the Commonwealth in arms. But the Americans also have impressed many people by the large proportion of Catholics among them, and by their devotion and constancy in the practice of their religion.—*The UNIVERSE, London, August 12, 1944.*

Anti-Semitism Prior to 1500

REV. ARTHUR RILEY, Ph.D.

THIS Good Neighbor Conference has been called to offer the clergy of metropolitan Boston an opportunity to discuss frankly the social evil of anti-Semitism. The choice of the subjects for discussion and the assignment of speakers of different religious faiths indicate a conscientious effort to present the historical background of the problem. Therefrom an accurate and realistic appraisal may be made of this question as it exists in our community. This basic honesty of approach and of plan for the future is the best guarantee of an eventual solution, for the problem can only be handled by frank and friendly cooperation between "men of good will" of all groups.

It is unnecessary to state that the anti-Semitic question is a problem, a grave and current problem. That is obvious from the wealth of literature of all types and in so many languages. It is likewise evident from the ever-increasing oral discussion heard on every side and among all classes. Grave as it is, however, we must not treat it as the major or the only problem of the moment. Anti-Semitism is but another "anti—" movement in a long and ugly series. Thus in Amer-

*Paper read at the Good Neighbor Conference held on September 6 and 7, 1944, at Revere, Mass.
Reprinted from the PILOT.**

ica we have a whole class of anti-movements, anti-Christian, anti-Catholic, anti-clerical, anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, anti-Mexican, anti-capitalistic and anti-labor groups, existing simultaneously and with considerable inter-relationship. This concomitance and this inter-relationship indicate the need for coordinated study of the whole field of the present social tension in order that effective social and religious planning may be initiated. Hence we would be well advised not to be over-optimistic of the possible success of this or any other conference, devoted to a study of one isolated movement. Over-emphasis upon any one sector and plans for its cure alone will but serve to focus much of the present tension on this one phase, a truly disastrous result.

The compelling necessity for such integrated studies somewhat lessens the significance of this conference. But the agreement upon an acceptable definition of anti-Semitism, the frank avowal of the causes of such

movements in the past and a realistic approach to the solution of the problem in conjunction with other solutions for other subversive social and religious trends will be a valuable contribution. The widespread publicity which may be expected for these conference papers will serve to bring to the attention of all men of good will the basic elements of the problem.

BASIC ELEMENTS OF PROBLEM

The fundamental problem of this conference and more especially of this paper which opens the conference is the proper definition of the term "anti-Semitism." Briefly but with entire accuracy it may be defined as "hatred for the Jewish people," as Pope Pius XI succinctly termed it on March 25, 1928. We shall do well to note these two terms in anti-Semitism, "hatred" and "the Jewish people." It is hatred alone which precipitates mass violence, hatred which leads to wide-spread confiscation, hatred which rouses the cry for mass conversion or death, hatred which stigmatizes even the converted Jew as an alien who must be hounded. Sentiments of less intensity do not cause these explosive outbreaks. Hence we must exclude from the scope of true anti-Semitism the minor sources of friction which are mainly due to an inability to appreciate the motive of actions.

This hatred, moreover, is directed

against the "Jewish people." Immediately difficulty arises as to the meaning of this term. Modern anthropologists have scientifically discredited an older belief that the Jews were or are a unit race. They certainly have not been a nation, in the strict sense at least, since the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. Today they are not even a unit religion, for there is more disparity between the different groups of Jews than between Protestants and many of these Jewish sects. With this phase of the question we cannot long linger, for many of its ramifications are still the subject of controversy.

A correct statement of the position, as accurate as can be posited at the moment, would assert that the Jewish people are those who practise orthodox Judaism or who have descended from those who did so in sufficient earnestness to be classed as believers. This classification is broad enough to include a diversity of practice today, a diversity bewildering alike to the Jew and the student of social and religious history. It would be a relatively easy matter to understand the opposition between Christians and strictly orthodox Jews; but there is a strange anomaly in the fact that there exists a racial opposition to the Jews who have given up the strict or even lax religious observances—the dietary restrictions, the observance of the holidays—and who today live pretty

much the same as their neighbors. To discover the basis for this apparent racial opposition, so baffling alike to the ultra-liberal Jew and the Gentle who dislikes him, is one of the most necessary problems of the moment.

Whence arises, then, this hatred of the Jewish people, so intense at times that it extends even to the Jew who is one only by descent? We may dismiss at once the belief that there is an innate hatred among all races for the Jews. The history of the Jew in China and India affords ample proof of the falsity of this belief. The fact, too, that the Jews cannot be scientifically identified as a race should further disprove it. Nor can this hatred arise merely from their "alienness," for again history has recorded the presence of other alien groups who were not treated with such venom.

Rather must it be said that this hatred arises from deep fear of the influence of the Jews, whatever that influence may be thought to be at the moment. At one time it is fear of their hostile political activities, at another of their usurious and crippling financial control, again of their open opposition to the established religious order with a trend toward the dissolution of that order, and yet again of their alleged character as the killers of Christ, as blasphemers, and as the avowed enemies of Christianity. Ofttimes two or more of

these fears may be conjoined in varying degree of emphasis, a variation, too, which changes during the same period from place to place. That some of these fears have been based upon or exaggerated by calumnious accusations is all too evident from history. That these calumnies live long after they have been proven false is likewise another sad phenomenon. All these facets of anti-Semitism must be correctly evaluated before any attempt at an eventual solution can be begun.

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE OF THE JEW

Fundamentally the Jew is different from all other peoples because of his belief and practice or because of a tradition of such religious activity. Through the ages he has endured all types of persecution to retain that belief and practice. Millions of them have resisted the blandishments of social equality, of political prestige, of normal cultural life that they might remain Jews. To that constancy of purpose, to that indomitable courage we pay glowing and deserved tribute. But our very tribute is witness to the difference that exists and will exist as long as Judaism and other religions co-exist. The problem of anti-Semitism which rises to the point of hatred is not primarily nor fundamentally religious.

The elimination of the religious basis for anti-Semitism is important.

Rationalists for the last one hundred and fifty years have kept insisting that one religion is as good as another, that differences are of no concern as long as they do not disturb the common weal. They have insisted that a man's personal beliefs or practices are his own concern and must be legally recognized and protected; they promise that, in an atmosphere thus free from repression, differences will gradually be minimized or even eliminated.

These sincere men have failed to accord proper importance to the place of religious beliefs in human life, as experience has shown. There certainly has been no repression of Jewish belief or practice in either England or America in the last century, even though there have been restrictions of other religious beliefs, as in the case of the Mormons. Yet today in both countries we note a rising tide of rabid anti-Semitism and this even though in both countries there is less concern with religion than ever before. It follows, then, that a rising tide of anti-Semitism can co-exist with a loss of interest in religious truths.

Moreover, if we analyze the statement that anti-Semitism derives from religious hatred, it must be because this religious hatred and anti-Semitism are fomented either by Church leaders or are inherent in the different religions. The last may be dismissed as historically

false, for the story of every religious repression by the people shows that some other cause or basis is more fundamental than any religious causes which have been asserted. The other conclusion that anti-Semitism of the violent type has been fomented by Church leaders can be dismissed, quite as summarily, by the testimony of history. Because of the prevalence of the charge, especially today, we must later return to a discussion of this. Having eliminated the religious basis for the hatred, we must see from history the truth of our claim that other elements are present.

In this historical study we must be prepared to accept the fact that an official policy is not overturned by one man or by a number of men, acting individually, if proper ecclesiastical or political authority denounces such actions. It is unfair and dishonest to stigmatize with opprobrium any religious group as a group because of the actions of some individuals even in positions of authority or respect, which actions have been repeatedly denounced by their superiors. It is all too true that there have been grave violations of charity and decency toward the Jews in the past on the part of those who by their position and training should have acted differently. In some cases they have been responsible for the introduction of the calumnious accusations which have since caused

such untold suffering. All of us righteously and rightfully condemn such men and such actions, but let not our accusation extend to the group of which they were unworthy members. Such an extension from individuals to groups by both sides of any intense question has caused incalculable harm and may serve to distort the present problem.

With the definition of anti-Semitism propounded and some delineation of the problem thus made, we can now turn our attention to the past.

WANDERINGS AND SUFFERINGS RECORDED

There is no more extraordinary page in history than that which records the sufferings and the wanderings of the Jewish people. For the first thousand years or more of their life history, the Hebrews were simply a small nation in western Asia, like any other except in their possession of a monotheistic religion. They were mainly agriculturalists and shepherds. Some time prior to 1600 B. C. they emigrated to the northern portion of Egypt because of a widespread famine. This sojourn lasted over four centuries during which they rapidly increased both in numbers and wealth.

A reorganization of national life, following the expulsion of the foreign ruling class from Egypt, brought to public attention the power of the Hebrews and their

position in a quarter where, if inclined to be disloyal, they could lend invaluable aid to Asiatic invaders. The fear of the Hebrew power and possible disloyalty caused measures to be taken by the Egyptians, first of repression, then of oppression and finally of racial extermination through the order to kill all male children. These failed. A growing Hebrew national consciousness, fear of this alien group and a series of plagues led the ruler of Egypt, held by many to have been Rameses II, to accede to the exodus of this nation from within his borders. Here is the first recorded instance of mass violence against the Hebrews as a people and it was caused by a fear of their power and possible disloyalty.

After years of wandering the Children of Israel were able to settle their nation in Chanaan. The subsequent history up to the conquest of Palestine by Rome is an involved series of individualistic tribal activities, temporary unification into a kingdom, and eventual discord which, by the last third of the tenth century before Christ, resulted in two kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

The Israelitic Kingdom lasted for two centuries until its destruction in 722 B. C. by Sargon II, of Assyria, who vigorously repressed the rebellion against him, and gradually merged the Israelitic stock into the composite race of Samaritans or

transplanted them to Northern Mesopotamia and Western Persia. There they developed and thence they spread to Southern Russia and perhaps to the region of Khurdis-tan.

The Kingdom of Judah endured for three and a half centuries. It was overcome early in the 6th century B. C. by the Babylonians under Nabuchodonosor, again as the result of an unsuccessful rebellion. The Jews, as they have since been called, were transported to Babylonia or escaped to Arabia and perhaps to India. This Babylonian Captivity lasted only sixty years, after which a portion of the Jews returned to Jerusalem to reestablish their nation. These Palestinian Jews now embarked upon difficult times.

External forces, as well as internal conflicts, made more precarious their fight for autonomy. From 323 B. C. on, Palestine became the battleground for Egyptian, Syrian and Roman ambitions. Internal conflicts arose from the opposed religious interpretations of the Sadducees and the Pharisees, which overflowed into the realm of politics and later led to armed intervention by Rome. Contact with Hellenism under Antiochus IV of Syria brought about a violent persecution of the Jews who refuse to yield one iota of their beliefs and practices. This violence left an unbridgeable gap between Judaism and Hellenism, even though

the Bible was translated into Greek and thereby brought into contact with the Roman world.

This antagonism between Jews and Hellenism had many repercussions in the next four centuries, notably in Alexandria and Cyprus where outrageous brutality occurred. The position of Palestine on one of the major crossroads of world travel brought about its eventual absorption into that Empire under Pompey in 63 B. C. Internal dissensions, continuing apace with a flurry of activity by false Messianic leaders, caused eventual open rebellion which was quelled by Titus in the period from 66 to 71 A. D. Thereafter the Palestinian Kingdom of Judah ceased to exist. But Jews were now to be found in China, India, Babylonia, Arabia, Ethiopia and throughout the whole Roman Empire, with the possible exception of Britain.

Under the rules of the Romans the Jews are generally said to have been favorably treated. Their citizenship in local cities and even in Rome was early recognized; later they were accorded the privileges of full Roman citizenship. They were exempt from the obligation of offering sacrifice and could enjoy full practice of their religious rites, except that involved in Temple ceremonial. The transient interference with their lives as Jews—namely, the order of Caligula that he be accorded Divine honors by all; and the interdict of

Hadrian against circumcision, the reading of the Law and the observance of the Sabbath—are generally interpreted as abnormalities.

But it is important to note that the Roman Empire did order, even if only once, the abolition of Judaism as a religion and that it did enforce an actual change of their essential worship throughout the duration of the Eastern and Western Empires by its refusal to allow the Temple to be rebuilt. To minimize this latter and to overlook the constant political rebellion which occurred on the part of the Jews for a full century is to effect a grave distortion of the historical picture. The Jews were not completely free under the Roman Empire. Following the destruction of the Temple, the Roman interference with religious activity of the Jews was prompted by Roman political purposes.

JEWISH PROBLEMS INCREASED

With the gradual disintegration of the Roman Empire, the rise of Christianity to a position of a recognized and later of a favored religion in the Empire, the spread of the Moslem Empire and religion, and the gradual development of the nations of Europe, the story of the Jews becomes even more involved and difficult. Within two generations after the Edict of Milan, the Roman Empire became a Christian state, a fact that was to have extraordinary politi-

cal and social repercussions for the next 1600 years. This new political institution recognized the supremacy of the State in political matters, the supremacy of the Church in religious matters, and the subordination of each to the other in the realm of the other.

Under this regime the Jewish religion, always a recognized religion, passed from its privileged position under polytheism to a privileged position under a Christian imperial government and later to a recognized position under a Christian feudal regime. The appreciation of that change in status is important if we are to gain a proper perspective of this period. Under pagan imperial Rome, Judaism was a minority monotheistic sect amid a series of polytheisms; its monotheism was recognized in law through the granting of certain exemptions from polytheistic administrative procedure. Under Christian imperial Rome and under the Christian feudal regime, Judaism was a minority monotheistic sect, now in the presence of a dominant trinitarian monotheism. While to polytheism Judaism represented only an eccentric religion with certain tenets difficult or impossible to assimilate socially and politically, to the Christians Judaism represented a religion whose mission was fulfilled and whose place in divine economy had ended with the coming of Christ as the Messias.

Clergy and people alike saw that if Judaism were the true religion in any period following the death of Christ, their Christianity was based on the greatest fraud in history. To the Jew, on the other hand, if Christianity were correct, then Judaism had failed to accept the Messias who had been promised, had outlived its mission which was to prepare for the coming of that Messias and which was to be completed through His teaching. The Jew and the Christian of the Middle Ages, equally with the orthodox Jew and the Catholic of today, understood the problem similarly: the truth of one religion was the guarantee of the falsity of the other. However much some may regret the possible religious, political or social effects of that statement, we must accept it as the exact and essential point on which Church and Synagogue differed in the medieval period.

Nor is this merely the question of an unfounded purely supposititious belief on the part of the Catholic and Christian Church. The Church knows beyond any shadow of doubt that She is the true religion, divinely founded and divinely protected. Hence She can, without malice, call all other religions false. Far from being a conflict between mutually opposed sects between whom no real choice can be made, the opposition is between a Church, guaranteed by God to be in full and complete

possession of religious truth, and the Jewish faith which continues to reject the truths which have been divinely revealed.

POSITION OF CATHOLIC CHURCH TOWARD THE JEW

The position of the Catholic Church with regard to the Jews has been and still is that the Jewish religion, as existing, represents the direct antithesis and contradiction of Catholicism. For that reason and for that reason alone She has striven to preserve Catholics from such contact with Jews as might cause harm to the purity of their Catholic faith. To attempt to read into the Church's activity in both papal and conciliar legislation an ebb and flow based on the reign of philo-semitic or anti-semitic popes is false history. Rather is it certain that the same basic principle has ever been present and that its applications range in stringency as the immediate occasion demands. Finally let it be understood that most of this legislation, born of a Christian State structure, has now been abrogated with the promulgation of the Code of Canon Law in 1918.

To attempt to analyze each piece of legislation, to determine the time limits and the extent of its enforcement, and to correlate some of the contradictions, will be utterly impossible in a paper of this type. Hence the broad outlines of such

legislation will be drawn, the fundamental reasons for it discussed and outstanding applications studied. Under such a plan we may present the legislation and promulgations regarding the Jews under these headings:

(1) Measures of direct protection of the faith of Catholics. These include the prohibition of marriages between Jews and Christians, the interdiction of Jews from political, civil or professional positions which exercise authority over Christians, the prohibition of circumcision of Christian slaves by Jewish owners and at times even the retention of such slaves, the destruction of the Talmud and the severe prohibition against reading that collection and the prohibition of Jewish interference with converts from Judaism to Christianity.

(2) Measures separating the social life of the Jews from that of Christians. These include laws requiring wearing of distinctive clothing, separation into given districts, interdiction from partial or complete exercise of certain professions or trades, prohibition of ownership of real estate, interdiction from appearing on the streets during the last three days of Holy Week, and protective rules concerning usury.

(3) Measures circumscribing the religious life of the Jews. These include the penalty of heresy against converts to Judaism from Christian-

ity, the restriction of the number, the ornamentation and size of synagogues and the prohibition against erection of new ones, the destruction of the Talmud, and enforced attendance at conversional sermons.

(4) Measures of protection for the Jews. These include the recognition of their religion under law, the prohibition of baptism by force, the guarantee of safe return to Judaism of forced adult converts therefrom, the protection of the synagogues or the restoration thereof if they had been wilfully damaged by Christians, and the defense of the Jews against such calumnies as ritual murder, ritual profanation of consecrated hosts and the poisoning of wells at the time of the Black Death. This is a long list and only summary treatment of each individuality can be expected.

The Catholic Church has always maintained that fundamental in the life of every creature is his relationship with his God. Being fundamental, that relationship must be completely protected from any unjust interference and from any contamination of the revealed truths which govern proper worship. This guarantee of the full religious exercise looks not only to the individual Catholic but also to any and every other believer. But full freedom to non-believers must be restricted when their activities interfere with Catholic worship or tend in some

degree to contaminate Catholic truth.

To protect the faith of Catholics the Church forbade such contact with Jews as might lead to continued religious discussion, to participation, active or passive, in Jewish religious ceremonial, and to control, direct or indirect, of Christians by Jews which might occasion the restriction of the practice of Catholicism. The extension of this to the destruction of books which contain teachings opposed to the Church or blasphemies against Christ and the Church is simply a safeguard against external contamination.

It is important to note here that such legislation follows inevitably from the relationship between Judaism and Christianity and is independent of the moral character or actual practice of Jews individually or collectively. The extent and the character of the restrictions are frequently determined by the latter characteristics. To the interdiction from certain professions and to the order for the destruction of the Talmud much objection has been raised on the grounds that these were unnecessary and unwarranted. Keeping in mind the Church's position, we see that the Church acted consistently in saying to the Jews: "You are an alien in a completely Christian framework; if you stay, it is on our terms; if you feel that your cultural development is impeded, you may either be baptized or leave; but

these restrictions are for the safeguard of the majority and must be enforced."

To the destruction of the Talmud more serious objection is raised because this was definitely denying the Jew even his religious books. When the condemned blasphemies and the anti-Christian utterances were deleted, the Talmud was allowed to be used by the Jews. History shows, then, that the Church placed definite restrictions upon Jewish activity whenever it constituted a danger for Catholics. These restrictions, in essence, were entirely logical and reasonable.

MEASURES SEPARATING JEWS FROM CHRISTIANS ANALYZED

The analysis of the measures separating the life of the Jews from that of the Christians involves factors other than religious. The regulations derive, like the preceding, from the Church's protection of Her children from threatened dangers, but the applications, insofar as Western Europe is involved, are dependent upon the whole social fabric of the feudal system. Fundamental to the feudal structure was the oath of allegiance based upon land and a pyramiding structure of such oaths in an interlocking arrangement from the serfs to the King. Ownership of land was primary to the exercise of political and social control. Hence such ownership was prohibited

to Jews lest they exercise such lordship and control over the Christians.

Far from resenting this situation, the Jews accepted it for two reasons: their desire to keep their capital liquid, to be able to move quickly either from personal desire or through forced expulsion, and their desire to keep their communal solidarity without the obligations incumbent on landed tenure. A further proof of the existence of this attitude is the fact that not once in the records of this six-hundred year period have I found a demand on the part of a Jew for such ownership nor a complaint that such a demand was rejected. As the feudal system developed, the Jews became equivalently a guild or a portion of the royal household in an extended sense. They were the King's own. Because of this position they had to accept certain obligations, one of which was a distinguishing badge to indicate the social group to which they belonged. The wearing of such badge or garb was prevalent throughout medieval Europe. Priests and monks of various orders and congregations, guild members, knights, professional men, even peasants of different localities had distinguishing marks which they at first wore freely and later by legislation after abuses crept in.

The "Jew badge," so called, was not the instrument of social degradation that modern authorities have

read back into the legislation of the period, but an administrative application of a custom normal to a group of resident strangers. True, its universal application at the time of the Fourth General Council of the Lateran has the earmark of penal legislation; but it was prompted by abuses which had arisen, chiefly in conjunction with the Albigensian and associated heresies. The similar separation into local districts was both the result of the desire of the Jews for communal solidarity and the effect of an administrative procedure which departmentalized various groups in particular sections. These, then, were questions of administrative procedure which were not essentially and exclusively calculated to degrade the Jew but rather to have him conform with the established custom of the period.

With the question of usury and of interdiction from partial or complete exercise of certain trades or professions, we come to a discussion of the current social and economic factors. The problem of usury is one which challenged the attention of the Church through the entire medieval period. During this era the Church fought with all the weapons at her command against a practice which had ruinous social and economic results. That fight was a losing one because of the conflict of many factors, not the least of which was the money which, from the licensing of

usury, came to the coffers of the Crown and political favorites.

After untangling this complicated skein, certain conclusions can be validly established. Some Jews were usurers; other Jews were connected with the usurers in the management of estates, in the collection of monies, in the selling of goods which had been pledged. There were likewise Christian usurers, notably the Lombards and the Cahorsin or Ultramontanes. The rates of all groups were high, in many cases ruinously so, but the rates exacted by Jews seem to have been no higher than those of Christians in all or even the majority of instances. Contrary to a frequent charge, it is an historical fact that the Jew was not pushed into the business by the connivance of the Church to provide a solution to an economic problem which She refused to allow Her own members to settle. The strangulation of economic life which resulted from usury caused widespread irritation, violence and eventually expulsion for Jew and Christian usurer alike and that on the ground of usury alone. There was some religious resentment against the Jewish usurer as a Jew, but it is by no means a universal concomitant phenomenon.

From these conclusions we can state categorically that the Jew is not innately a usurer, that the conflict with him as usurer was inherently an economic conflict, and that

his usury alone was not responsible for the widespread strangulation of economic life which occurred from time to time in the medieval period.

GREED PLAYS LARGE PART IN RESTRICTION ON JEWS

As to the interdiction from partial or complete exercise of certain trades or professions, we can arrive at no general conclusions. In some instances, such as the prohibition of Jewish lawyers from pleading in Christian matrimonial cases, we can see wise administrative procedure. In the rejection of the Jew from certain guilds we can see the factor of greed. In the restriction of Jewish medical activities, we can see both superstition and the fear of use of lax or non-Christian moral standards. But, generally speaking, each case must be studied separately; no universal conclusions can be drawn.

The third series of measures, those circumscribing the religious life of the Jews, are inexplicable to people who feel that one religion is as good as another or who proceed on the assumption that from theoretical principles full freedom must be accorded to all. The Church has maintained in theory and practice that Hers is the only correct, divinely revealed and hence authoritatively binding doctrine. Rejection of that doctrine in whole or in part is the rejection of the word of God

Who cannot err. Hence continued rejection of the Church's doctrine by an adult baptized Catholic must mean the obstinate rejection of truth.

There is nothing strange about that viewpoint. We find it more difficult, however, to understand why such obstinate rejection should lead to the death penalty, reserved as it is today for murderers and traitors. To the medieval Catholic such rejection was traitorous and they accorded to it the capital penalty. The Catholic certainty of the truth of Catholic belief gave basis for an insistence that non-believers should attend sermons on that Catholic Faith, since it was hoped that upon hearing the explanation of the correct doctrine they would immediately embrace the Faith and be assured of all the graces of salvation.

Conversions, however, from such enforced attendance were negligible, precisely because of the pressure applied. These restrictions upon Judaic life are understandable enough from the viewpoint of the medieval Catholic, as was the destruction of the Talmud, previously discussed, for its blasphemies and anti-Christian utterances. The restrictions upon the synagogue building flows from the same principle, although the motives for this have frequently been distorted by historians. If the Jewish religion was one which God Himself had superseded, then its buildings

in style, ornamentation and number should not be allowed to rival the churches of the true religion. Considerable harshness has been frequently noted in the interpretation of this legislation and much unfairness was shown, which is to the everlasting discredit of those responsible. Again, though, these measures have proceeded from a fundamental belief in the correctness and superiority of the Christian religion and from a desire to protect the purity of the religion from any contamination.

Within these limits the Church has maintained that the Jews were free to practice their religion among themselves. That may seem a contradiction in terms or pious vapors in view of the large number of the actual restrictions. However, let us be fair about it. They were granted their synagogues, even in Rome and Avignon. Violations of the synagogue or destruction thereof were punished by requiring not only the repair or rebuilding of such buildings but extra penalties as well. Cases where this was overlooked or actually forbidden are so few as to be clearly contrary to the general trend. The Jews were guaranteed their freedom to remain Jews. Popes and Councils alike forbade the forced baptism or molestation of Jews and backed up that legislation. True, it was violated and not infrequently, even by ecclesiastics. But it would

be unfair to maintain that the Church officially winked at such practices, considering the severity of papal language on those occasions. In general, too, adult Jews who were forcibly baptized, were allowed to revert to Judaism when the popular clamor abated and this frequently by express papal command.

Finally the Popes courageously and in face of general popular antagonism have defended the Jews against calumnious accusations, notably of ritual murder, of ritual profanation of consecrated hosts and the poisoning of wells at the time of the Black Death. The two calumnies, ritual murder and ritual profanation, still reappear, occasionally under the names of estimable men, even though they have been repeatedly termed as vicious by Popes. This protecting charity amid wise administrative procedures has been the official tradition of the Church.

ACCUSATIONS HURLED AT CHURCH DENIED

Before concluding this treatment we must first treat of the accusation made on so many sides that the official attitude of the Catholic Church has been responsible for the outbreak of modern radical anti-Semitism. These authors point to the parallel between all the modern actions and the legislation and the events of the medieval period; the examples cited are the "Jew badge," the enforced

restriction to the ghetto, the exclusion from positions in political, civil or professional life, and even the mass-murders.

The argument receives various developments. In general it proceeds from the unbridgeable gap which Christianity has placed between itself and the Jew, which thereby places the Jew in a subordinate and inferior position which requires that the Jew is made a mere vassal and a wanderer. To this is often added the accusation that the Church stigmatizes the Jewish race as "Christ-killers" and hence the most odious of murderers.

Further developments include the charges that the Church has deliberately misrepresented, either by silence or by positive lie, the true position of the Pharisee, the true picture of the Crucifixion, the essence of the early and later conflict between Christianity and Judaism, and the nobility of the contribution of the Jew to civilization. This last is even amplified to the point that the Jews gave the world Christ Himself, the early Christians and the entire Catholic religion which then ungratefully persecuted its forebear and robbed her of her inheritance. In many cases such theses are presented with citations from Catholic sources and with the most imposing array of scientific critical apparatus. Rash indeed would he be who would attempt to overturn such highly

respectable historical conclusions! Or, are they so highly respectable?

As stated in the earlier portion of this paper, instances of anti-Semitism must be judged from the end sought or attained. Radical anti-Semitism which would eliminate Jews or seeks to exclude them by death or expulsion, which denies them a part in society because of their race alone is one thing — a thing incidentally which has been vehemently condemned by Pope Pius XI. Such anti-Semitism is based on hatred. The opposition to religious tenets which are the direct antithesis of Christian principles and which seeks neither exclusion nor death is quite another. There is no instance in official Church pronouncements which even hints at universal exclusion or mass murder. Temporary exclusions, occurring outside the limits of this paper, were ordered by Popes for specific violations. The ejections from European countries took place under secular authorities, with no command or hint from the Papacy, and even in spite of their protests on occasions; the reception of these wanderers into the Papal states is proof of that.

But even when this point is admitted, some scholars still maintain that the accusation against the Jews of deicide or "Christ-killers" has been and is the source of all antagonism and is the source of the element of hate in anti-Semitism.

Bluntly it should be said that the Church has never officially said or stated that the Jews as a race are responsible for the death of Christ. True, some Christian writers have made such an interpretation of the Gospel phrase, "His blood be upon us and upon our children." Such men are of the negligible minority and Catholic tradition has definitely excluded that interpretation, as impartial examination will show. It is also true that certain rabble rousers have preached such a doctrine in time of crisis to arouse men to violence. But it is not nor has it ever been an official interpretation of the Church.

Objection is likewise made to the charge that those Jews who actually procured the death of Christ were guilty of the deicide, were Christ-killers. Some historians have attempted, but in vain, to show that such an accusation is false. Their argument is based upon a conglomeration of rationalistic interpretations and of apocryphal narratives of the trial and crucifixion of Christ; their conclusions may be rejected forthwith.

Other students for more practical reasons feel that the Church is unwise and unfair to the Jews to connect even unworthy representatives of their race or religion with this heinous crime. Such suppression of historical facts is a dangerous procedure and generally leads to increased

tension when the suppression is discovered. This then brings us to the fundamental statement, that radical anti-Semitism is due to the stigmatization by the Church of the Jew as a member of an unorthodox religion.

VERY NATURE OF CHURCH BELIES ANTI-SEMITIC ATTITUDE

The Church has thus termed the Jew a member of an unorthodox religion. But it has not thereby rejected him as an individual nor condemned him as inferior in himself. The Church as a religious organization ardently yearns and sincerely prays for the conversion of the Jew; once baptized, each Jewish convert is received into full fellowship and communion of faith, thereby proving the absence of any belief that there is an essential inferiority due solely to religion.

As previously seen, the Church would act contrary to her mission of salvation for all were She to be a partner in the movements of mass-violence, in the pogroms or in the systematic destruction and extinction of the Jewish race. Let it be remembered that the conversion of the Jews to Christianity is one of the marks of the second coming of Christ—the only nation or people for whom such a promise has been made. Hence we answer the charge that anti-Semitism derives from an untrue characterization of the Jewish religion by

denying that any such anti-Semitism has resulted or can result from such doctrine. The burden of proof that it is otherwise lies on the historian who makes the charge. He must show in each case that this ground alone is responsible for the outbreak of the movement of violence.

It may be added that if such be the case, he must similarly prove the point in the case of persecution by the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Romans and the Moslems, for each and all of these held Judaism to be an unorthodox religion. The opposition, then, between Judaism and Christianity has not been and is not the cause of anti-Semitism as defined in this paper.

Up to now I have mentioned only the restrictions which the Catholic Church through papal and conciliar legislation imposed upon the Jews directly of itself, or indirectly through local rulers. There has been no discussion of the persecutions and the massacres which occurred with saddening frequency during the Middle Ages. This treatment has been postponed to this portion of the paper that a true picture of the Church's relationship with the Jews might be presented. With that true picture must now be conjoined a survey of the political history of the period. This postponement is, I think, valid also because the official policy of the Church has been older and more constant and because the

Church preceded the rise of all the States of that and later periods.

The Church contributed much to the political and social development of the European Middle Ages. But her influence was not constantly the same, nor was it equal in contiguous geographical regions at a given time. This gradual political evolution, the conflicts between king, nobles, cities, Church and people, the external conflict with the rising and later threatening Islamic Empire, all formed an ever-changing background against which the story of the medieval Jew must be studied. Within the limits of this paper only broad generalizations can be made; even the status of Jews in any given national history cannot be discussed because of lack of space.

With the development of feudal Europe we are familiar. The gradual evolution of strong national government exercising sway over a definite geographical area in which no other political autonomy was tolerated took centuries. During this process the kings made such alliances with one or more of the social and political groups with whom they could in order that they might increase their power. At times these alliances were unwise in formation and destructive in result.

Dependent in large measure upon the aid the Jews gave to this process was their treatment dictated. If the King needed money, the Jews were

protected by royal power as long as they could furnish an income to the treasury, or they were expelled because confiscation or forced sale would be of greater benefit. If the King felt that national unity could better be attained by religious unity, then the Jews were asked to accept baptism wholeheartedly or leave. Thus the Jews were banished from various cities in Germany in the 15th century, expelled from England in 1290, from France, finally, in 1394, from Spain in 1492 and from Portugal in 1493.

WIDESPREAD PERSECUTION AND MASS VIOLENCE

In these political movements the Church had no hand. Popes did refuse to approve some measures of expulsion; no Pope asked or demanded such forthright measures. However, Popes, ranking Churchmen and local clergy asked that the restrictions, which were an inheritance of the days of the Roman Empire, be enforced and from time to time they added new ones to meet changing conditions. That such requests were not always granted is evident from re-enacted legislation and from later demands. That such restrictions were effective in preserving order and avoiding expulsions is evident from the experience of the Eastern Empire and of the Papal States.

That the Jews suffered much

apart from these royal extortions and expulsions is only too well known. Widespread persecutions and local instances of mass violence are the matter of sad record. These violences and massacres are traceable to the following causes: usury which had strangled local economic life and hatred aroused by fanaticism or calumnious accusations. Vehement opposition to strangling usury was directed against the Jews and their religious associates as usurers. Religious opposition sometimes was present and just as often absent. The fanaticism and the calumnious accusations are more difficult to understand and explain. These have occurred when governments have been strong and likewise when they have been weak, when the Church had a tremendous influence over the lives of men and when that influence was at low ebb. The only common note is the presence of tension, be it local, national or international. That tension once existing, the accusations against the living Jews as "Christ-killers" at the time of the First Crusade, as murderers of children or desecrators of the consecrated hosts for ritual purposes after 1171, and as poisoners of the wells to rid the world of Christianity at the time of the Black Death, spread like wild fire and Jews were massacred by the thousands.

Despite repeated and thunderous denials of the truth of these calum-

nious statements people could be aroused again by fanatics in time of tension. For this no satisfactory explanation has yet been offered nor can one be now given. Why people accept as true calumnies long since disproved, currently evident as ridiculous, and even when the object of the calumny has been absent for hundreds of years, is still inexplicable psychologically.

One historical fact must be kept clearly in mind. No such widespread massacres of the Jews occurred in the medieval Papal States, assign what reason you will. I think we may safely conclude that the Papal restrictions, based on rational premises and charitably but firmly enforced, were the best guarantee to the Jew of immunity from violence and from degrading persecution and expulsion.

This series of repressions, persecutions and massacres of the Jews during the medieval period is frequently contrasted with the treatment accorded them by the Islamic Empire. The absence of such violence, the excellent treatment of the Jew in many parts of that Empire and the development of a high degree of Jewish culture, particularly in Spain, are frequently cited as evidence of a more favorable solution of the Jewish problem. This evidence is usually presented as indicative of the lack of charity in the Church and the Christian society which sup-

posedly is based upon the law of love proclaimed by Christ and as likewise indicative of the administrative genius of the Moslems. Such restrictions as appear in the history are treated as temporary aberrations from a noble tradition. This is not in accord with historical fact.

In general the Moslems despised the Jew for his religion and that in accord with the fundamental book of Mohammedanism, the *Koran*, which stated that the Jews were infidels. Mahomet himself at first friendly with the Jews whom he wished to win to his new faith, persecuted them when they turned from him in disgust because of the over-emphasis on sexual delights both in this life and the next. When he joined the sword to his religion, he quickly overcame two Jewish-Arabian tribes and exterminated a third. The second Caliph, Omar I, banished all Jews from holy Arabia and drew up the "Covenant of Omar," which imposed restrictions upon Jews throughout the entire Islamic world.

By this the Jews were excluded from administrative and judicial offices and otherwise politically discriminated against. Socially they were given an inferior status and forced to wear distinguishing marks upon their clothing that they might easily be distinguished from their Moslem and Christian neighbors. Their religious freedom was sharply restricted since they were not al-

lowed to build new houses of worship nor restore those in ruins, and since they were to sing in subdued tones in their synagogues and only to pray silently for the dead.

These restrictions were not universally enforced at all times nor even with the same severity throughout the Empire at a given time. The distinction of clothing, the social inferiority and some species of religious intolerance were insisted upon in the African and Asiatic portions of the Islamic Empire at all times, not too occasionally in a stringent manner. Widespread persecution, especially under the Fatimide Caliph, Hakim, and under the Almohades, reached the point of enforced conversion or emigration. This is certainly not favorable treatment!

This undoubtedly may come as a sharp surprise to many who have made the treatment of the Jews in Islamic Spain the norm for the Jewish status in the entire Empire. In Spain, there were factors of peculiar historical significance. The Moslems maintained their European stronghold in Spain against constantly increasing pressure from the Northern Christian kingdoms. The Jews under Moslem domination were accorded a favored status to preserve administrative and national integrity against this ever-present threat which at length drove the Moors from Western Europe. That this treatment was accidental, dependent upon

local circumstances and utterly opposed to the Moslem tradition is indicated by the absence of such a constantly high degree of Jewish culture in other parts of the Empire either during the medieval period or after the conquest of Moorish Spain by Ferdinand and Isabella.

Jewish freedom in Spain was an historical phenomenon—born of political necessity and maintained in favor of a contrary tradition; when that political necessity was absent, the status of the Jews under the Moslems continued as or reverted to that of social, political and religious inferiority.

LONG CONTINUED PERSECUTION

We have seen that the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Romans, the Moslems and the European Christians have persecuted in one form or another the Jews in the period prior to 1500 A. D. All these peoples considered the Jewish religion unorthodox. Restrictions on the full exercise of the Jewish religion eventually occurred under all these nations for administrative reasons. Violence occurred when the Jews revolted against the existing power, when the desire for national unity sought to exclude those who were aliens because of their alienness, when political avarice saw in Jewish monies or properties an opportunity for personal gain and when fanaticism or calumnious accusations

focused popular discontent upon the Jew.

No people have been the object of such long-continued persecution or the object of such vile calumnies who have remained so steadfast. We discredit the lack of administrative foresight which sought to exclude the Jews merely because of their alienness. We leave to the unerring judgment of God those fanatics and the perpetrators of malicious calumnies. We deeply regret that such unfortunate incidents, written in so much innocent blood, have taken place. But from them we can draw valuable lessons that the future may not be stained by such disgrace. We recall, too, that the Papal States have been free in the period under discussion from such violence. Therefore I think we may justly conclude that at least a partial solution of the problem was there attained.

On that basis, then, one of the most important contributions which can be made by this conference is the elimination once and for all in the mind of each one here that the Catholic Church is responsible for modern anti-Semitism. It has been shown to be a false statement historically. Sociologically it is dangerous, and religiously it is suicidal, for it asks that one of two things logically be done; either eliminate Catholics because their Church is considered to be the precipitating factor of this social evil, or eliminate the question

of the Messianic mission from controversy. Either course of action but accentuates the very tension whence anti-Semitism springs. Far from settling the problem, it will only end in subordinating all religion to sociological, naturalistic and rationalistic norms, which means the end of Judaism or else its endurance of a new and violent persecution.

GOOD WILL MOVES MOUNTAINS

Many have in good faith accused the Catholic Church of causing and fomenting, perhaps unconsciously, the evil of anti-Semitism. Let those who have done so be now assured that they have been misled by opponents of organized religion. Many made the accusation in bad faith, seeking violence to attain a mass movement against religion. Such men wish but to subordinate the things of God to the norms of men, to make of a generation human guinea pigs for the germination of their preconceived notions born of hatreds and jealousies. To point accusing fingers at definite individuals will serve no purpose. It is enough that we recognize these movements for what they really are.

"That they may be one, as Thou, Father in Me and I in Thee, that they may be one in Us," Christ prayed in His beautiful testament of love on the night before His death.

That prayer has been the guiding spirit of the Church through the ages, is the ideal of every priest, bishop and Pope of the Catholic Church. With that prayer in my heart has this talk been prepared, written and delivered. Blunt statements have been made, perhaps in blunt fashion, not to offend, but to arouse people to the reality of the problem and to the importance of correct thinking in seeking a solution. To ignore the problem would be to consign it to misdirected and unwatched festering. To dismiss it with the words "love thy neighbor," would be failure to meet a challenge.

The charges and accusations, the aims and intentions must be brought into the open. Neither side has anything to fear from the truth. Mistakes there have been on both sides. Let the authors of those mistakes be left to the judgment of the God of love, Who will searchingly ask the reason for such lack of charity. Recognizing and admitting the mistakes, we can better avoid them in the future. Good-will can move mountains. Good-will born of true knowledge and zeal for cure can solve this problem. Under God, through God, with God, can God-fearing, God-loving men come to mutual love and agreement.

SOME THINGS OLD AND NEW

MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST

*What is meant by the name *Mystical Body of Christ*? I have frequently seen this phrase used, but I do not quite understand what it means.*

You cannot do better than read the great Encyclical of Pope Pius XII *Mystici Corporis*, of the Mystical Body of Christ, which was issued on June 29, 1943, and is published by The America Press (*Catholic Mind*, November, 1943).

In simple and forthright language, the Holy Father defines the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ and shows what is meant by the phrase.

This Mystical Body is one, because it consists of all the members of the Church who have been baptized into the True Faith, and are thus bound together and to Christ, Who is their Head, into one spiritual body.

But the Mystical Body is not confined only to the members of the Church Militant here on earth. It includes also the Church Triumphant in Heaven, as well as the Church Suffering in Purgatory. When we pray, we pray not alone, but as members of one great Body here and in the life beyond. That is why in the Liturgy the prayers are almost entirely in the plural: for it is not the individual who

is praying, but the whole Mystical Body praying in and through Christ its Head.

Study the Mass carefully, note the collects and other prayers and observe how they are spiritual aspirations, not of one member, but of all the members who make up the Mystical Body. And note further that all these prayers of the Sacred Liturgy are addressed to God the Father "through Jesus Christ" *Our Lord*. That is the fundamental idea of the Mystical Body—our oneness in and through Jesus Christ. *Ego sum vitis et vos palmites*: I am the Vine and you are the branches. That is Our Lord's explanation of the Mystical Body.

POPE AND POLITICS

Is it true that Catholics owe any sort of political allegiance to the Pope? I have heard much on this subject, and would like to know what is the actual position.

There is only one set of Catholics who owe any sort of political allegiance to the Pope, and they are the citizens of the State of Vatican City, a Sovereign State of which the Pope is the temporal ruler.

But as there are no elections in the State of Vatican City; as there is no

mayor and city council; as there are no political parties, the political situation in Vatican City sits very lightly on those few hundred persons who are citizens. The law of Vatican City is the Canon Law of the Church; and although there is a criminal court, it is not often that defendants are called up for judgment and sentence.

However, outside of Vatican City, Catholics nowhere owe any sort of political allegiance to the Pope. They owe him the obedience which is due to him as Supreme Pontiff of the Catholic Church and, should His Holiness visit our country, he would be entitled by everyone, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, to the honors paid to the Ruler of a Sovereign State.

There is, of course, this proviso. Should any secular State impose upon its citizens a program that is contrary to the Divine Law, then the Catholics of that State would be obliged in conscience to oppose and vote against such a program. But in any such instance it would not be political allegiance to the Pope, but a question of faith and/or morals. And it is the Pope's duty, as Vicar of Christ and Supreme Teacher of the Universal Church, to guide the Faithful in matters that concern either faith or morals. If politics conflict with Christian ethics, then there is no doubt whatsoever that every sincere Catholic must obey God rather than Caesar. But that does not mean that the Pope

has either power or right to claim any sort of allegiance from Catholics in the matter of party politics. You may be a republican or a monarchist, but that is no affair of the Pope. It is your faith and morals which he is obliged to guide and protect.

VATICAN DIPLOMACY

Why is it that the Pope, who is a clergyman, receives diplomatic representatives? The Archbishop of Canterbury does not receive diplomats. I would like to have it explained.

Of course the Pope is a clergyman, though it is not altogether easy to think of him just in that light. The Archbishop of Canterbury also is a clergyman of his denomination, and the first Peer of the Realm in England after the royal princes.

But the difference is this. The Archbishop of Canterbury is the most distinguished prelate of the Anglican Church and Primate of All England. But the Pope, besides being Bishop of Rome, is also Ruler of the State of Vatican City. The Popes have been rulers of the Pontifical States for centuries, even when those States were taken away from them. But since the Lateran Treaty of 1929, the Pope has been recognized in International Law as the Ruler of Vatican City; in other words, the Pope is not only a Bishop, but also a Sovereign Ruler.

Now the English Government is not exactly what you might call a Catholic government — far from it.

Yet in 1934 the King's Regulations issued the order that the Pope is to be regarded as a Foreign Sovereign and is to be saluted in accordance with Article 43. Nuncios and inter-nuncios of the Pope are also to receive a salute as ambassadors. So if the Pope should ever visit any part of the British Commonwealth, he would be saluted by the same number of guns as any secular king or president.

So it follows that the Pope, not as a Bishop or clergyman (if you can think of him in that way), is recognized as a Sovereign Prince; and as such receives and sends diplomatic agents to foreign governments as ambassadors or ministers.

The Vatican is represented abroad outside Vatican territory by two kinds of agents: nuncios and inter-nuncios, and delegates apostolic. A nuncio or inter-nuncio is a diplomat of the first rank, and since the Congress of Vienna in 1815 he is always ex-officio dean of the diplomatic corps and takes precedence of all other ambassadors. An apostolic delegate, on the other hand, is an unofficial agent or representative of the Pope, and has no official or diplomatic position, though in England and Japan the apostolic delegate enjoys all the rights and privileges of an official diplomatic representative of the Pope, except that of preceding the secular ambassadors.

Sometimes the Pope is represented by an agent known as *chargé d'affaires*, which is a lesser diplomatic office.

The apostolic delegate to England is also *chargé d'affaires* to the Polish Government in exile, and a Bishop exercises the same function to the African Republic of Liberia.

PAPAL DEPOSITION

Is it at all possible for the Pope to be deposed and removed from his office as Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church?

No, it is not at all possible; for the Pope is *de fide* Head of the Church, and as such he cannot be deposed or removed from his office.

But, and this is entirely hypothetical, should any Pope, exercising his pontifical power, proclaim any heresy, he would by that very fact cease to be Head of the Church and therefore cease to be Pope—in fact he would cease to be a member of the Catholic Church.

This is, of course, an imaginary situation, since you ask what is a possibility and not about a matter of fact. But let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that any Pope did profess some heresy and, furthermore, that he persisted in claiming to be Bishop of Rome and Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church, then a General Council of the Bishops of the Catholic Church would have the right and the power to remove an heretical Pope from his high office.

Now this, it must be admitted, is a very tricky question. For a General Council has no legislative power un-

less its decrees are approved and authorized by the Pope. So there you would have the position of a General Council which in ecclesiastical law would not really be a General Council, removing from office a Pope who has by the profession of heresy ceased to be Pope.

Actually it would not be the deposition of a Pope, since by any heretical profession he would have ceased automatically to be Pope, and it would seem that right would be on the side of any such General Council, since it would represent the entire episcopate of the Catholic Church; whereas any

imaginary Pope who professed heresy would represent only himself.

But that is the only circumstance in which a Pope could conceivably be deposed or removed from his pontifical office. It is beyond reason that any such incident should occur; but if it should come to pass, the procedure outlined above is what would happen. But the General Council would not have the function of electing a new Pope, for that belongs to an entirely different category. The election of a Pope pertains to the College of Cardinals, and the College of Cardinals is not, and does not pretend to be, a General Council of the Church.



THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: John LaFarge

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: B. L. MASSE

ASSOCIATE EDITORS: Charles Keenan, Joseph A. Lennon, John P. Delaney

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: William H. Dodd, Henry Watts

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York, N. Y.

PUBLISHER: Gerald C. Treacy

BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.